

The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 25, 1879.

The Week.

GENERAL GRANT'S reception at San Francisco forms in every way a pleasing contrast to what it was at the beginning of the year feared it might be. Instead of being seized on the wharf by a crowd of political jobbers and converted into a Presidential candidate a year in advance of the election, partly in ostentatious preparation for civil war or some sort of illegal "salvation of society," and partly in covert preparation for the return to power of the corrupt gang who brought disgrace on his Administration, he has come back amidst the enthusiastic welcome of men of all parties, as a great general who has deserved well of his country and whose military talents have met with much respectful recognition abroad, and to whom a return to honored repose in his own land is very grateful. When one sees how passionately the people desire a hero whom they can admire and applaud simply and heartily as a man, and not as a candidate, and how desirable it is in the existing condition of American life that there should be such a hero in American society, it is difficult to find words of condemnation sufficiently strong for the plans, both past and present, for using this simple soldier as the head of the Machine, or as the pea with which the managers did their thimblerigging. Grant's fame, as the war left him, was one of the national treasures. The politicians did their mortal best to destroy it, and had he been an older man they would have succeeded. It has happily survived their snares, and everything should now be done to keep it intact during the remainder of his life.

The President has made two speeches during the week. At Youngstown, Ohio, he discussed "the objects for which we fought in the great conflict from 1861 to 1865," and elaborately considered the question "What was settled by the war?" This he did in great measure by reading extracts from Mr. Lincoln's Gettysburg speech, defining the reciprocal relations of the States and the general Government, which we all know are excellent, and which, "in the third year of the war and while its result was still undecided," as Mr. Hayes remarked, were most timely. At present, since, according to the President, "no one would again attempt to break up the Union by secession," their interest is chiefly historic perhaps; but the President seemed to feel their applicability to the present condition of things, as "there still remains in some communities a dangerous practical denial to the colored citizens of the political rights which are guaranteed to them by the Constitution as it now is." About the existence of a widespread disposition in the South to nullify the Fifteenth Amendment he had no doubt. Hence arose a question in which "the whole country is deeply interested." It would not do, he thought, to call it "an affair which belongs solely to the distant States of the South." Just how the whole country was to manifest its interest in a way practically efficacious the President did not say, though this is, of course, the whole point of the controversy now raging. The tone of his entire speech was as Stalwart as the least temperate of his party could reasonably expect from a man of such a strong conservative bias, and he evidently thinks discussion of "war issues" still pertinent. What he said will be likely to have considerable public effect, we should say, for the reason that while its attitude is Stalwart its air is characteristically dispassionate, almost to colorlessness. The Detroit speech was of much more practical value. It discussed the revival of business, the evils of municipal indebtedness and how to avoid it, recommended paying off the national debt in thirty-three years, and was generally concerned with a class of topics whose existence is scarcely recognized by the orators in an active political campaign.

There is in Detroit, however, just now nothing like the amount of patriotic anxiety about the salvation of the country that exists in and around Youngstown.

The *New York Times* on Thursday, discussing the President's recent speech, speaks of "the renewed presentation by the South in Congress of the doctrine on which the theory of secession rested, and the declaration (from the same quarter) of a purpose once more to attempt the application of this doctrine to the administration of the Government." Now, the doctrine on which the theory of secession rested was the Calhoun doctrine—that the Constitution was simply a treaty between independent States, which any one of them could abrogate, in so far as it was concerned, at any time, by withdrawing from the Union, and, *à fortiori*, that any State could, *by State legislation*, refuse to permit the execution of any objectionable federal law within its borders. If "the South" has presented this doctrine in Congress since the war, it must have been either in the speeches of a majority of the Southern members, or in the speech of some one Southern member of acknowledged influence or authority, or in a resolution voted for by the majority of the Southern members. If the *Times* cannot produce one or other of these sources for its statement, that statement is simply an invention made for electioneering purposes, and intended to aggravate and embitter the sectional animosity which is already working so much mischief, and of which any paper which does not openly proclaim itself a regular "organ" ought to be ashamed. Attempts to repeal federal laws by a majority in Congress is not "nullification," or anything like nullification, however worthy of condemnation it may be at the polls.

Governor Robinson has accepted his renomination in a clear, modest, and sensible letter, in which he confines his remarks to State affairs exclusively, and makes no allusion to Tammany. He devotes himself mainly to showing what has been done for retrenchment and reform in the State government during his three years' administration, but claims no credit in connection with it for himself and other officers but that of faithful obedience to the constitution and the laws. Some of his figures tell a remarkable tale, and they are not to be questioned. In 1874 the canals cost the State in direct taxation \$2,373,425 over and above the tolls. In 1878 they cost it nothing, their expenses having been reduced from \$3,842,892 to \$903,347, and these wholly met by the tolls. In 1876 the prisons cost the State \$704,379; this year they cost it nothing. In 1874 the State taxes were \$15,727,482; this year they are only \$7,678,103. At the close of the war the State debt was \$51,041,537; it is now, minus the Sinking Fund, only \$8,130,726. The letter has all the ring of the old Silas Wright Democracy, and the Governor, to the best of our knowledge and belief, has fairly lived up to his doctrine; but then his probity and efficiency may after all, like so many of the political, social, and even physical phenomena of the day, be only "a Tilden move."

There has been nothing more entertaining in the papers of late than the reply made by Mr. Tilden, through a *New York Times* reporter, to the charges made against him by Mr. Cyrus W. Field of having secretly, treacherously, and in violation of an agreement, sold out, or "unloaded," a quantity of Elevated Railroad stock. Mr. Tilden not only flatly contradicts Mr. Field's most important assertions, with numerous accompanying comments of a highly derogatory character on the quality of Mr. Field's mind and on the condition of his morals, but produces figures, taken from the books of the company, showing, if correct, that many of the other directors, and more than one member of Mr. Field's own family, had been already "unloading" very freely at the very time when Mr. Field says there was a general understanding that everybody in the ring was to refrain from selling, and before Mr. Tilden had sold a

share. In fact, if Mr. Tilden's story be even half true, Mr. Field's story becomes somewhat incomprehensible. There is, however, one very serious side to the matter. The *Times* editorially gives credence to Mr. Tilden's defence. Now, it was settled in 1876 that *every* charge against Tilden was, *ex necessitate rei*, true, and that anybody who questioned it or closely examined the evidence on which it was based, was probably actuated by corrupt motives. We are, therefore, driven to some very painful conclusions with regard to the present relations of the *Times* to this Wicked Old Man, which are not weakened by its open and, considering everything, somewhat shameless declaration that he is "clearly in possession of vigorous intellectual capabilities."

To the Pelton part of Mr. Field's charges Mr. Tilden replies that it is amazing "moral audacity," or "immoral audacity," to assert that he knew in June, 1877, "all about Pelton's transactions in regard to the cipher despatches," when he testified before the Congressional Committee that he knew nothing about them until the despatches were published in September, 1878. He further added that Pelton's "wrong" did not go beyond a "futile dalliance," which is not a bad phrase for so old and infirm a man. He said a good many other things about the vote of the Florida and Louisiana elections in 1876, indicating that he believed it was bought by promises of office which have since been fulfilled. In fact, his conversation was full of scandalous matter, showing that he is, when provoked, a very ugly customer.

On Wednesday of last week Governor Robinson issued an executive order convening an extraordinary General Term of the Supreme Court, and designating Judges Davis, Brady, and Ingalls to hold the term. Judge Barrett was afterwards appointed in place of Judge Ingalls, on account of the latter's ill-health. The court met on Saturday, and an application was at once made by counsel representing the Mayor for an *ex parte* order bringing the questions pending before Judge Westbrook in the case of Police Commissioner Nichols before the General Term, quashing the *certiorari* proceedings, and staying all Mr. Nichols's proceedings, or for an alternative order, under a statute passed in 1873 (authorizing the Court at General Term to issue writs of prohibition to a single justice in the same way that such writs are issued to inferior tribunals), prohibiting Judge Westbrook from proceeding with the case. The judges being of opinion that the matter was too important to be decided on an *ex parte* motion, granted an order to show cause, which will be argued this week. It is greatly to be hoped that the General Term will, after the argument is had, come to a decision which will bring to an end the police troubles now practically paralyzing the machinery of municipal government in this city, besides doing a great deal to bring the administration of justice into contempt. Apart from the merits of the quarrel between the Mayor and the Police Commissioners, the spectacle of both sides fighting each other with judicial orders is very unwholesome, and strongly recalls the days of the Ring.

The struggle, of course, really hinges upon the appointment of inspectors of election. Two thousand odd of these officials, selected equally from the two political parties, ought to be appointed by the first of October. These inspectors have charge not only of the polling places but also of the registration, which is the sole guarantee the city has of a fair election. The theory of the system is that the inspectors of each party act as watchers upon the inspectors of the other, and ordinarily there is no difficulty in applying the theory in practice. This year, however, there are not two parties, but three, and as only two sets of inspectors can be appointed, it follows that one faction must be left out in the cold. The Police Commissioners have the appointment of these officials in their hands, and the Police Board is now evenly divided. Three lists of inspectors have been submitted to them, one by the Republicans, one by Tammany, and one by anti-Tammany. As to the first there is, of course, no dispute; but of the two others the Tammany list is the

one which the two Republican commissioners, Messrs. French and Wheeler, desire to have adopted; while the anti-Tammany list is that which Messrs. Morrison and MacLean insist upon. Mr. Whitney, the Corporation Counsel, has sent in an opinion (concurring in by Judge Emott) to the effect that the statute with regard to the appointment of inspectors contemplates the selection of the lists from representatives of the two regular political organizations known as the Republican and Democratic parties, and that consequently a faction opposing the regular nominees of either party, as, for instance, the local party now identified with Tammany Hall, and led by John Kelly, cannot be recognized at all. This seems a fair interpretation of the statute, but it is not satisfactory to Messrs. French and Wheeler. The legal proceedings directed by the removed Commissioners, General Smith and Mr. Nichols, if successful, would in all human probability result in a combination between them and the Republican Commissioners to appoint Tammany inspectors. It is unnecessary to point out that, in the eyes of the unregenerate, the evidences of a bargain between Kellyites and Conklingites are rather overwhelming. The good and pure, however, who believe it to be important to elect Cornell to save the country from the Rebels, reconcile themselves to the situation by the reflection that the end in view is glorious enough to palliate any means.

General Butler has had three nominations for the governorship of Massachusetts, by Independent Democrats, Independent Republicans, and his own party, which is a composite body and has put up Mr. Wendell Phillips for the lieutenant-governorship. All three carefully avoid mention of national affairs in the platforms, but call loudly for State reform. What Butler's opinions on national affairs are at present, if known to any human being, is known only to himself. But it ought to be added that there is a sign in this of something which the Republicans would do well to heed, and that is, that interest in the quarrel with the South which the Republican party is trying to live on is undoubtedly declining with the masses, and as it declines they are the more readily led off into other fields of activity like "Greenbackism," which is really a name for a desire for changes of all sorts. The demagogues see this and act on it, but the Republican chiefs cannot be got to see it, and go on ding-dong with the same old story about the rebels and the war. Maine has furnished one warning about this. We trust Massachusetts may not furnish another.

It is useless to discuss the Butler platforms. The "true inwardness" of the movement was explained by Mr. Simmons, the late Boston collector, who has joined it as an "Independent Republican," as has Mr. Palmer, last year a prominent member of the Republican State Committee. Simmons says frankly that what they seek is to get the government of the State out of the hands of what he sneeringly calls "the better element," who give themselves such airs of purity and goodness—that is, the "Harvard men," and "high-toned men," and "prominent financiers," and "civil-service reformers," and "patriotic men," who have had hold of it ever since the anti-slavery men turned out the Winthrop and Everett Whigs with the gold-headed canes. He says "the common people" must now take hold of it, and this is the revolution which Butler is to bring about.

What the result will be it is difficult to say. Many things—such as the revival of business—have happened since last year to diminish Butler's chances, but, on the other hand, such accessions as Simmons and Palmer indicate that he will get the support of a class this time which last year had not made up its mind to throw in its lot with him. Mr. George Hoar did not injure him by eulogizing General Grant, at the regular Republican Convention, as "a great statesman" as well as "great soldier," for it recalls the fact that it was General Grant who handed over the State patronage to Butler, and who, in defiance of the protests of "the better element," made Simmons, Butler's henchman, collector, and thus gave them both the weapons of influence and machinery with which they are now

assailing the party. In fact, the sky all over the country is dark with Republican chickens coming home to roost. One of the signs of the increased efficiency of Butler's organization is that he is keeping very quiet himself. Mr. Wheeler is probably right when he says that to ride out to Harvard Commencement as Governor would probably fill the measure of "Old Ben's" desires. The spectacle would probably draw the largest crowd ever assembled in Massachusetts.

Specie importations continue, and have, up to the time of writing, amounted since the first of August to \$27,000,000 in round numbers. Foreign exchange strengthened early in the week so as to check imports, but later the market fell back to the free importing point, and new lots were started from Europe. The money market has worked easily at 5 to 6 per cent., the receipts of foreign specie having more than outweighed in the bank reserves the large shipments of currency to the West and South. The Treasury 4 per cent. bank account with the banks, which was to have been finally settled on the first day of October, has been closed, or very nearly so, so that the Treasury has no longer a direct concern in the loan market, and United States bonds have advanced steadily. Mr. Sherman, finding that he could not "redeem" legal-tender notes with gold at any Treasury office except that in this city, has issued a circular saying that in Treasury payments, all over the country, a percentage of each shall consist of gold. General trade throughout the country is unmistakably active, and at the Stock Exchange there is a furor which causes anything that is low-priced, whether good, bad, or indifferent, to be taken up, and advances the price of it, on the calculation that some one on whom the fever has a stronger hold will buy it at the advance.

What about that International Silver Conference? What Powers, if any, have signified their willingness to take up the subject? What signs are there, if any, of that rapid spread of the bimetallic idea in Europe of which we heard so much before the Maine election? Where is Kelley? Silver is still accumulating in the Treasury and is still worth considerably less than gold, though all politicians talk as if they were the same thing.

Lord Beaconsfield's inaccuracy, especially in dealing with all financial, commercial, and geographical questions, has long been a standing joke in English political circles, and would long ago have killed a politician of less *aplomb* than himself. His explanation of the agricultural difficulty at the Lord Mayor's dinner, on which we recently commented, was exceedingly diverting. But no blunder he has lately perpetrated has been so extraordinary as his announcement at an agricultural dinner at Aylesbury, the other day, that since the opening of the Hudson's Bay Company's territory "nearly all the chief landholders in the extreme Western States of America had sold out" and moved over into the Canadian wilderness, to get the benefit of the fertile land and the comparatively low taxation. He is quite capable of inventing this himself, feeling sure that the Buckinghamshire farmers would swallow it, and no correction of it would ever reach them, and that his followers in Parliament would simply laugh, and exclaim, as the late Mr. Bagehot said they were in the habit of doing when he was more than usually absurd, "That's just like Dizzy." But it is more charitable to suppose that some waggish American has made him the victim of a gigantic "sell." Apropos of this, he justly observes himself of Villebecque, one of the characters in 'Coningsby': "He was master of his subject; in all things the secret of success, and without which, however they may from accident dazzle the world, the statesman, the orator, the author, all alike feel the damning consciousness of being charlatans."

The mails from England show that when the news of the tragedy at Kabul arrived the public rushed headlong into the delusion that Kabul would be promptly occupied. They have probably recovered from it by this time. If it is reached before the first of December it will be good work. There are all sorts of rumors about the disturbed condition of the country, and the Amir is writing apologetic

and hopeful letters to the Viceroy. It is plain to be seen, however, that he is a weak person, who will never be able to reign alone, and the story that the mutiny and massacre were set on foot by a stronger brother is not unlikely. Attention has been called to the fact that reports of the brewing of the plot were current in Herat and Teheran some weeks before the outbreak, and were sent to a portion of the Indian press by their Persian correspondents at the very time when Lord Lytton was telegraphing rose-colored accounts of the success of the embassy. Cavagnari is a great loss to the Empire. He was in all ways one of the most remarkable men in the Indian service. He was half Irish, half Italian, and had extraordinary diplomatic skill in dealing with the semi-barbarous tribes of the frontier, an almost unprecedented gift of tongues, and, though small and slender, was so good a swordsman and horseman, and had a courage so cool and dauntless, that no native soldier who knew him would care to face him on anything like equal terms.

Cetewayo, surrounded on all sides and hunted like a wounded bear, has at last been captured. He is said to have borne himself with dignity at his surrender, and asked to be shot, but has been sent to Capetown, where he is to be kept as a prisoner of state for the present. Of course this ends all further danger of resistance. The plan of reorganizing the government of Zululand has been made public, and it consists in the erection of a number of petty principalities on the ruins of the old monarchy, some of them being those that were extinguished in the early part of the century by the invasion of the Zulus, who came down from the north. Each chief is to have a British Resident attached to him, who will supervise his rule, but without authority to interfere otherwise than by report to the Government in Natal, from which permission to make war must be obtained. The country is to be absolutely closed to white immigration. How the plan will work remains to be seen; but there can hardly be a doubt that the Zulu monarchy showed by its great organizing power that, if it could have been made peaceable, it was the best instrument which could have been devised to raise the nation out of barbarism.

The German National Liberals have published their platform in preparation for the Prussian elections. They declare their unchanged attachment to liberal institutions; denounce the attempt to modify the Constitution by making the taxes votable for two years instead of one; demand a reduction of direct taxation, the maintenance of the Falk laws, and the reform of the internal administration, especially by an increase in the sphere of local government; suspend judgment about the state purchase of the railroads, and call for renewed energy on the part of the Liberal bourgeoisie in city and country in making themselves heard in the political arena. It is not what our "workers" call a "ringing" document, but shows that the party still hangs together and has a policy.

Whether there has been really danger of a break between Russia and Germany is probably known to nobody but the German Chancellor, but the press of the two countries has for some weeks been talking as if war was imminent; the story being that Russia, in order to escape from her present internal troubles and stop the progress of Austria among the Slavs, was going to make another onslaught on Turkey, and carve what remains of it in her own fashion, counting on the support of France in the mêlée that would ensue. The latest news is that the trouble, if it ever existed, has blown over through the meeting of the two Emperors at Alexandrovno. But the mere uproar shows how far the Treaty of Berlin is from being a finality, and how much the scene has been changed by the light thrown on British military resources by the war in Afghanistan and Zululand. The Russian press makes no secret of its belief that their diplomatists were humbugged by Beaconsfield's threats. The next conflagration will undoubtedly break out in Rumelia, where the disorder is so great that the Sultan may be tempted to interfere, and thus furnish Russia with an excuse, if she desires it, for again taking him by the throat.

THE MORAL OF THE CHISHOLM TRIAL.

GENERAL STEWART L. WOODFORD, who went to Mississippi to assist in the prosecution of the Chisholm murderers, has given his impressions of the political situation at the South, formed during his visit, in an interview the report of which he certifies to be correct. It is very interesting and instructive in various ways. There is no doubt that the killing of Chisholm and his children in the jail by a mob was a foul murder of a very revolting type. It took place in April, 1877, when the mob stormed the jail to which Chisholm had been conveyed on a charge of complicity in another murder, of one Gully. In trying to get at Chisholm they killed or mortally wounded his son and daughter, who threw themselves in the way. In September of the same year the Circuit Judge charged the grand jury with reference to the offence "in words as burning and severe," says General Woodford, "as have been used to characterize the deed by any sober-minded man even at the North." The grand jury thereupon indicted thirty persons belonging to the mob. The case, after much delay, came on for trial a few weeks ago. It was tried by the Circuit Judge who charged the grand jury, and, according to General Woodford, "he did his duty fearlessly and justly. If he erred at all in his rulings, he erred in favor of the prosecution and against the defence." The District-Attorney, too, "did his duty well and bravely. He prepared his case with care, and tried it with good sense and sound professional judgment." He was assisted by Mr. Morris, of Vicksburg, "one of the most logical and forcible criminal lawyers whom he [General Woodford] had met at any bar." "The prosecution made out a clear and complete case of murder; the charge of the judge was distinct, direct, and positive; and yet the jury were out only long enough to take one ballot and write their verdict." The jury was composed of nine white men and three negroes, but "it was fairly drawn." Fifty-five of the seventy-five names drawn for the special *venire* presented themselves in court. Twenty-five were black and twenty-six white. "Whatever else may be said of Kemper County, it must," General Woodford adds, "be frankly admitted that the jury-list of the county is fairly made up. It contains over two thousand names. Two-fifths of this number are black and three-fifths white. The officers charged with making this list have done their duty impartially, and the special panel drawn from this entire list was honestly drawn." This, it must be remembered, is the testimony of a United States District-Attorney for the Southern District of New York, a strong Republican, who was himself on the spot and watched the proceedings with a critical eye.

Now, this Chisholm case has been used lavishly for the last two years by Republican papers of various shades of opinion as a case which illustrated the political condition of the South, and which proved, or helped to prove, the necessity of combining against the South, and making denunciation of it and hatred and distrust of it one of the principal duties of good Republicans. They treated it, in other words, as a sign that the policy of conciliation was a mistake, and that Southern men were still in a rebellious state of mind; and the *Tribune* assured its readers nearly every week that no attempt would ever be made to punish the perpetrators of the crime. The political exploitation of the incident even went so far as to induce the unfortunate Mrs. Chisholm to deliver a public lecture on the tragedy in which her family perished. It now appears that the machinery of justice, in so far as it is in the hands of officers of the law, worked perfectly; that, indeed, it worked not only as well as it would have worked in any Northern State, but probably better than it would have worked in most Northern States in which popular feeling ran so strongly on the side of the accused. The jury expresses the popular feeling in their verdict, and this feeling is, General Woodford says, "that it was unfortunate but natural" that Chisholm, Gilmer, and McClellan were shot by the mob; that the Chisholm children were accidentally killed, which "is universally regretted," but "that the conviction and execution of anybody for the deed would be equally unfortunate, and that the entire matter had better be allowed to die out and be

forgotten." General Woodford thinks this unfortunate state of things will be cured by "a division of the white vote between opposing parties," and that this decision will probably be brought about by "a Republican victory under a wise, brave leader in 1880," as this will convince the Southern Democrats that their hope of holding a united South on "the issues of race and white rule," under the patronage of a friendly Administration at Washington, is a chimera.

In these conclusions General Woodford is, we think, partly right and partly wrong. The effect on the Southern mind of a Republican victory in 1880 will depend on the platform on which the victory is won, and the aims put forward by "the wise and brave leader." If it is won on "the bloody-shirt" platform and on the theory that every negro is *ex vi termini* a Republican, and the language of the canvass spreads the belief that the great aim of the new Administration will be to build up a black party in those States in which negroes are in a majority or nearly in a majority, we have no doubt—human nature being much the same at the South as everywhere else—that the effect will be to keep the white South as "solid" as it is now, as the best protection against the thing it most dreads—negro rule. A Stalwart, denunciatory, exultant North, revelling in the memories of the war, comparing every election to Gettysburg, and searching every corner of the South with the fierce light of newspaper criticism and report, for the purpose of turning all crimes, outrages, and disorders to political account, and indicating by every speech and article and vote its desire to see the Southern State governments in the hands of its own friends, without regard to their character or intelligence, cannot but keep the race question uppermost in the Southern mind, and prevent a division of the whites on any other subject—for all subjects are in their eyes trivial compared to this.

There are too many signs already that this is the kind of Republican victory for which the managers of the party are preparing. The effect on the South of Mr. Hayes's policy, which has been sound, just, and wise, has been largely neutralized by the fierce opposition it has encountered from these men from the beginning, and it is worthy of note that there is not one of the Presidential candidates now in the Republican foreground who ever raised his voice or exerted his influence against the shocking abuses of federal and carpet-bag rule between 1865 and 1876, or ever professed to think that in being subjected to them the Southern whites were getting anything but their due. Most of those who are making complaint about the ingratitude and irreclaimableness of the South are men who never gave the slightest sign of dissatisfaction with the régime which Mr. Hayes brought to an end by withdrawing the troops, and they have never ceased to proclaim their desire to see that régime restored. If the Republican party takes the field in 1880 with a "wise and brave leader" of this kind, the Southern whites will necessarily become "solid" before it, not because they are Southern or white, but because they are men. The appearance in the arena of a party having similar designs towards any Northern State—that is, the design of giving over the State government to a grossly ignorant majority led by characterless adventurers—would make all the persons of intelligence and property "solid" against it without fail, although the "solidity" would show itself in decenter ways than murder and arson.

A Republican victory, on the other hand, which promised the administration of federal affairs at the South through carefully selected and respectable officers, and in a spirit of pure justice, legality, and moderation, taking account of the weaknesses and misfortunes of the whites as well as those of the blacks—that is, "with charity for all and malice towards none"—would undoubtedly be a civilizing agency of the highest order. But such an administration would have to abstain from all schemes of party advantage and especially from seeking to make party votes, or reward party services, by the distribution of the public offices among party "workers"; and yet to nine out of ten Stalwart chiefs good government at the South means just this distribution and nothing more.

General Woodford, too, falls into the error of supposing that what he witnessed in Mississippi was something new or peculiar either to this period of Southern history or to the South. We venture to

assert, though, of course, without having the figures at hand, that no conviction for murder has ever taken place in Mississippi in any case in which the prisoner was able to show that the killing was the result of a previous quarrel, or that he had reason for bearing a grudge to his victim. We have ourselves had a man of good standing in Mississippi pointed out to us, before the war, who had killed thirteen persons and had never been convicted. In fact, if General Woodford had known the South a little better he would have known that the old common-law rule, which makes malice prepense tell against the accused, is, and always has been, reversed in the slave States. In them he has always pleaded it in bar or in extenuation. So that to treat of affairs like the Chisholm case and the Dixon case, as they are treated by a large proportion of the Republican press, as political phenomena created by the present state of political feeling at the South, and preventable a year or two hence by a rousing Republican victory at the North, is political quackery of the lowest order. They are symptoms of a state of civilization which began centuries before the Republican party was ever heard of, and will probably not wholly disappear until the last Stalwart has been fifty years in his grave. The difficulty with which General Woodford saw the Mississippi district-attorney contending was one, too, with which prosecuting officers in Ireland and in Corsica have been familiar ever since juries began to try criminal cases. In both countries nothing is commoner than to find it impossible to get juries to convict foul and bloody murderers, simply because they see, or think they see, excuse for the crimes in the peculiar condition of society. The experience of mankind has shown, however, that this depraved condition of public sentiment is cured not by savage denunciation from without, but by patient persistence in good government, and by bringing the afflicted community into such intellectual, social, and commercial relations with happier portions of the nation that it shall share its shame and horror as well as its hope and ambition.

THE GROUNDS OF THE INDEPENDENT REVOLT.

THE nomination of Mr. Cornell points forcibly, and it is to be hoped in a salutary manner, the distinction between the party and the Machine. The Machine, when it condescends to argue the question of its own justification, assumes the rôle of the hand-maid of party—indispensable, it is true, but still ancillary. All its anxious study of the political horizon, its lonely midnight vigils, its thankless arrangement of primaries and conventions, its earnest appeals to the constancy of its fellow-partisans, its laborious and faithful reasoning with its opponents, its incitements to vote on election day and its care for the purity of the suffrage, are prompted by a holy desire to ensure the triumph of the great principles of the party, and a disinterested concern for the administration of the Government in accordance with them. Even after its hollowness is exposed, and judgment is about to be executed upon it by its victims, its prayer for mercy and for one more trial is uttered in the sacred name of party. "Not for our sake," it pleads, "but for the cause. The State ticket we have prepared for you may seem faulty, may even merit defeat, by itself considered. Unhappily on this occasion, by an unforeseen conjuncture of circumstances, on the fate of it depends the success of the national ticket next year. They stand or fall together. Will you, can you, sacrifice to your resentment the welfare of the country, the hopes of future generations?" As the saviour of society and the party the Machine thus plays its trump card.

And what, all this time, is the party? It is an organization whose chief, when it is in power, is the President of the United States, and the authoritative expression of whose common sentiments and aims is the platform adopted in national convention. If the President is true to the platform, the Machine should be at one with both; if it is not, and is found in contemptuous opposition to him, the theoretical unity of the Machine and the party disappears. Such, notoriously, is the present situation in New York, and it is a contradiction in terms to pretend that Mr. Hayes and Mr. Conkling are members of the same party. The nomination of Mr. Cornell was a flagrant act of insubordination, rendered purposely insulting, and

intended to prove that the Republican party exists for the Machine, not the Machine for the party. Translated into the political phraseology of the day, it was an attack on the validity of the amendments of the party constitution to which Mr. Conkling had sworn allegiance. The successive modifications of party platforms conformably to the progress of public opinion may be likened, with perfect justice, to the alterations which from time to time our State and national charters undergo. The civil-service plank in the Cincinnati platform was a deliberate and distinct concession to the convictions of the better class of the Republican party. It was inserted because it was demanded; it became an integral portion of the manifesto with which the Republicans went before the country, was singled out for emphasis in Mr. Hayes's letter of acceptance, and was as solemn and binding as any article in the creed. To disregard, ridicule, and assail, or transfer from the President to his subordinates the duty of interpreting it, as soon as the election had been carried—if it was carried—by means of it, was nullification, in all respects analogous to that by which a State might now refuse to respect an amendment to the Constitution by the formal acceptance of which its return into the Union was secured.

Mr. Conkling's revolt offers another aspect which also has its parallel in the present denunciation of the South. When he calls upon the Republicans of New York not to make a State issue of Mr. Cornell's nomination, to regard it only in its national bearings, and vote accordingly, he implies a federal supremacy in the party which ought to be heeded by the rank and file. The rank and file, however, may properly insist that this supremacy, which overrides personal and local considerations, shall be acknowledged by the Machine as well as by themselves. Why is not the doctrine of State sovereignty as good for them in State elections as it was for Mr. Conkling in the matter of State patronage? If the control of the New York Custom-house warranted flat defiance of the party's position in regard to the appointing powers of the Executive, and the business character of the civil service, what other party tenet is so inviolable that Republicans must forego for it their right to choose their own candidates for the administration of their State? To this the Machine's answer of course is that the voter is not to judge what is essential and what is non-essential in the party platform; that the Machine will attend to that and to his conscience too. The consequence is that the Republican constituency of New York is as completely strait of the right of self-government as any Southern State under carpet-bag rule. And, indeed, if we enquire into the amount of real interest which Conkling and his henchmen take in the welfare and prosperity of the State, their likeness to the extinct carpet-baggers is irresistibly striking. Absolutely, beyond the accident of their residence here, they are as alien as the pasha of a Turkish vilayet, their motives summed up in two words—power and plunder. Their political interest is centred in Washington, because there is the administration not of principles but of places. Their political life and dependence are federal, as much as so Parker's, or Spence's, or Kellogg's; and when the President withdrew the troops from South Carolina and Louisiana, the Machine everywhere felt the blow as aimed at itself.

In this, it is to be suspected, its instinct was truer than Mr. Hayes's perceptions, who saw clearly enough his constitutional duty to the South, but overlooked the connection between it and his pledge on behalf of civil-service reform. Nothing, in fact, could better demonstrate his confusion of mind than his immediately rewarding with federal offices the men who had brought the South to the condition in which he found it. The Machine South, in other words, was exactly the same in theory and practice with the Machine North; only its ravages had been greater because it had the support of the military arm of the Government. Instead, however, of being left to its fate when the right of the South to self-government was acknowledged, and the military called off, its managers were provided for as if martyrs who had deserved well of their country. Such are the illusions which party always breeds in those who look upon it as an end and not as a means. The root of the evil called carpet-bag government lay in the Senatorial manipulation of State

polities through the federal patronage; but this was not invented for the South—it was merely extended and applied there. If there was any difference worth insisting on, it was that at the South the Machine and the party were convertible terms; at the North their identity was at least open to dispute. In the nature of the case, this is a distinction and not a difference; and unquestionably, if Mr. Hayes could have restored the South to its rights without breaking up the Machine, he would have done so—just as Mr. Lincoln would have saved the Union, if he could, without abolishing slavery.

To save the party, however, provided it is worth saving—that is, if it is composed in the main of voters who sincerely desire the good of their country; who think platforms should be honestly lived up to, and more or less heartily believe that a public office is a trust and not a prize—to save the party and the Machine too is beyond any man's ability. He who does not apprehend this has not passed the primer of his political education. He who is blind to the fact that the Machine and the party, in the sense just indicated, not only are not one, but are essentially and permanently antagonistic, has yet to learn the meaning of "reform within the party." This does not signify merely changes in the creed, or fresh shibboleths to match the aspirations of the times, but resistance to the oligarchy which makes hypocrisy of the creed, and answers the demand for pure and upright functionaries with bargained candidates of "slates" and "rings." Such is the understanding alike of the pessimists who despair of reform within the party, and of the Machine itself, which sees no difficulty in the way and never could see any; for both are firmly convinced of the Machine's superiority to all attempts to dislodge it. The approaching election in this State will show how far the Republican voter who thinks and acts for himself is penetrated with the idea that, in this age and country, a self-reforming party is a party in revolt—the horse against his rider, Sindbad against the Old Man of the Sea.

THE FAILURE OF BRITISH RULE IN INDIA.

II.—THE FAMINE IN THE NORTHWEST PROVINCES.

LONDON, August 27, 1879.

In my last letter I spoke of the evils which had been inflicted upon the people of India by the want of fixed principles and a continuous policy in our administration of the country. In nothing has this evil appeared more conspicuously than in our methods of dealing with famines. These of late years have been appallingly frequent. It is at present customary to assign them entirely to causes over which the Administration has no control—the failure of the regular rain-fall, spots on the sun, no matter what, so long as no responsibility on their account attaches to the Government of the country. In truth, however, they are mainly due to our maladministration. The causes which combine to produce an Indian famine are multiplex, and differ according to the districts in which the scarcity occurs. But the chief of them are directly due to our own recklessness and want of forethought. These have occasioned a dire impoverishment of the soil and a corresponding impoverishment of those who cultivate it. The consequence is that a very slight decrease in the customary rain-fall suffices to reduce the soil to a state of sterility, while the cultivators, always destitute, become a prey to famine the instant there is any abrupt rise in prices. It is not too much to say that on a right understanding of this matter depends the existence of our Indian Empire. At present I am concerned only with a particular scarcity—the famine of 1878 in the Northwest Provinces.

As you are aware, the larger part of our Indian revenue is derived from the land. The Indian Government is a part-proprietor of the soil of India, and a fixed portion of its produce is set apart every year as the share of the Government. The proper method, therefore, of dealing with famines is, in India, not so much a subject for philanthropists, as an essential and most important duty devolving upon the Administration. A year of famine not merely diminishes the revenue for that year, but affects it unfavorably for many years to come. The cultivators are impoverished; their physical vigor is impaired; their cattle perish; and thus great tracts of land which ought to return revenue fall out of cultivation and produce nothing. But there exists in India nothing answering to our English poor-law. The consequence is that in times of scarcity, unless the state comes to their aid, the two classes of day laborers and small village shopkeepers must inevitably perish. For the former there is no work, because in years

of drought the land is so dried by the action of the sun that it cannot be broken up for sowing. And as the latter subsist by providing for the wants of the former class, the ruin of the one involves the ruin of the other. These considerations render state relief during periods of famine a matter of imperious necessity in India. In keeping its agriculturists alive the state is, in point of fact, keeping itself alive. It is merely sacrificing a portion of the revenue it derives from the land in order to save the remainder. The commonplaces, sound enough elsewhere, as to habits of improvidence engendered in the people by indiscriminate state aid have no relevancy in India. So long as our taxation leaves to the cultivator nothing beyond the bare margin of subsistence, the state must keep him alive in seasons of scarcity. Nevertheless, as can easily be understood, the Indian Government has been most reluctant to acknowledge that it is under any such obligation. The Indian Government always lives up to the extreme limit of its income, and generally a good way beyond it. A governor-general and his council hold office only for five years, and their chief desire is to do something dazzling and sensational during his term—to make a war, to construct a thousand miles of railroad, to excavate a canal—anything which can be made the subject of a self-eulogistic report. There is nothing dazzling in the sacrifice of revenue for purposes of famine relief. Such sacrifices were specially abhorrent to the feelings of Lord Lytton and his Council, because they required every farthing they could scrape together to go on a wild-goose chase after a "scientific frontier." But they were aware of the indignation which would be excited in England if a famine occurred in India and the Indian Government looked passively on while hunger was claiming its thousands of victims. Accordingly, when, in 1877-78, a terrible scarcity arose in the Northwest Provinces, the Government imagined the ingenious device of denying that there was a famine, and so evading the necessity of devoting any part of its revenues to the relief of the destitute. It is the story of this denial that I am about to relate, together with the amazing untruths uttered by the Government when the fraud was discovered.

The cultivated land in the Northwest Provinces is mainly under two descriptions of crops—the rain crops and the cold-weather crops. The rain crops are sown towards the end of June, or shortly after the rains have set in, and are reaped in October and November. The cold-weather crops are sown in October and November, and are reaped in March and April. Thus during the three hottest months of the year, April, May, and June, the cultivated land of India is a bare plain exposed to the parching action of the sun and the hot winds. It is baked to the consistency of sun-dried brick, and if rain does not fall and there are no irrigating canals, the fallows cannot be broken up, and scarcity is inevitable. In 1877 there was an almost total failure of rain in the Northwest Provinces. At the end of September all that portion of India was like a vast desert. Not a drop of rain had fallen for months; not a blade of grass was to be seen anywhere, and, instead of the rain crops covering the land, there was utter sterility. At the best there could be no food, either for the people or the cattle, until the spring crops were ripe for harvesting; but, if no rain fell during October, the spring crops too would be lost, and then the Northwest Provinces would become a scene of mortality and suffering hideous to contemplate. But during the first week of October there was a heavy and continuous downpour of rain, and the hardened soil was sufficiently moistened for the spring sowings to be accomplished. Still, though the spring crops were now safe, the present destitution of the people was in no way alleviated by this circumstance. The winter lay between them and their spring crops, and the cold during the winter is in the Northwest Provinces extremely severe. It was obvious that if a fearful loss of life was to be averted prompt measures would have to be adopted to provide food for the foodless agriculturists. Sir George Couper, the Lieutenant-Governor of the Northwest Provinces, reported to the Government of India that the rain crops had been "irretrievably ruined"; and he added that if any demands were now made on the village communities they too "will simply be ruined." It has always been a standing principle in our administration of India that a failure in the productiveness of the land shall be accompanied by a corresponding remission of revenue. This principle obtains its sanction from the fact of the Government being a part-proprietor of the soil, and, as such, under a moral obligation to participate in the adverse fortune of the cultivators, just as it reaps an advantage out of their periods of prosperity. But a government which had already determined to hunt to death an old and faithful ally because he was supposed to be in possession of a "scientific frontier," could not afford to be less rapacious in its dealings with its own subjects than towards its ally. Sir George Couper was ordered to exact the full amount of the land revenue from the destitute and starving populations. Nay, the Government of India went beyond even this. Por-

tions of this famine-stricken province had lately been reassessed at enhanced rates, and these rates came into operation for the first time in 1878. Sir George Couper was ordered to exact from his people the enhanced rate. Had he been a man of humane or independent character he would have flatly refused to be the instrument of such rapacity, and would have boldly appealed to the House of Commons against the inhumanity of the Indian Government. But Sir George Couper is simply an utterly incompetent Bengal civilian, possessed of neither courage, independence, nor convictions, and in response to the orders of the Government of India he merely "trusts that the realizations will equal the expectations of the Government of India; but if they are disappointed, his Excellency in Council may rest assured that it will not be for want of effort or *inclination to put the necessary pressure on those who are liable for the demand.*" I ask you to take special note of the passage I have italicized. Sir George Couper knows that his people are starving. He has reported that they "will simply be ruined" if they are subjected to the exactions of Lord Lytton and his Financial Member of Council, and then professes his "inclination"—his positive delight—in screwing those exactions out of them. From this single fact your readers will, I think, be able to understand how it is that British rule in India is so profoundly unpopular.

But having thus resolved not to remit the land revenue, Lord Lytton, Sir George Couper, and their coadjutors were compelled to go a step further. They had to make believe that there was no need for remission—that there was no famine. The people were to be allowed to perish, but the administration of the provinces was to be carried on precisely as if nothing unusual was occurring. It was thought that in this way the famine would simply work itself out, the Government would get its land revenue, and nobody in England or elsewhere need know anything about it. It well illustrates the enormous gulf which divides the English from the natives in India that such a thought should have entered into the mind of a government; but more remarkable still, the project was very nearly succeeding. During all that dreary winter death was busy claiming his victims. At the lowest computation, more than a quarter of a million perished of actual starvation. The number would have to be doubled if it included all those who perished of disease, the result of insufficient food and exposure to cold; for in the desperate endeavor to keep their cattle alive the wretched peasantry fed them on the straw which thatched their huts, and which they used as bedding. The winter was abnormally severe, and without a roof above them or bedding beneath them multitudes perished of cold. The cross-country roads were strewed with the dead. Scores were cast into old disused wells as the readiest means of getting them out of the way. Mothers sold their children for a single scanty meal. Husbands flung their wives into ponds to escape the torment of seeing them perish by the lingering agonies of hunger. Lord Lytton and his colleagues and advisers maintained their serenity and cheerfulness undisturbed. The local papers in the Northwest were persuaded into silence. Strict orders were given to civil officers to open no relief-works in their districts, or in any way to give countenance to the pretence of the natives that they had no food. One civilian, a Mr. McMinn, unable to endure the misery he saw around him, opened a relief-work at his own expense. He was immediately suspended from his duties and punished by degradation to a lower office.

All this time not a whisper of the tragedy that was being enacted in the Northwest had reached Calcutta. The Government was well aware that in Calcutta there was a sufficient strength of public opinion to shatter to pieces the plans they had resolved on. And, but for an accident, it is not improbable that the famine might have passed off without its existence being known in Calcutta. But in the month of February Mr. Knight, the proprietor of the Calcutta *Statesman*, had occasion to visit Agra. He was astonished to find all around him the indications of an appalling misery. He began to investigate the matter, and gradually the truth came out. A quarter of a million of British subjects had perished, hunted even to their graves by the pitiless exactions of a Government which had looked on unmoved at their sufferings.

Mr. Knight made known through the columns of the *Statesman* what he himself had seen, and what he had learned from others in the course of his enquiries. Lord Lytton and Sir George Couper felt they must do something to extinguish Mr. Knight. The official newspapers were instructed to denounce him as a mendacious journalist, who rejoiced in calumniating an infallibly wise government because it procured him notoriety. At the same time Lord Lytton and Sir George Couper drew up a report in which all Mr. Knight's statements were flatly denied, and Sir George Couper eulogized as a far-seeing philanthropist. Mr. Knight, however, was far too strong a controversialist for his official adversaries.

In a series of trenchant leading articles he established, to the satisfaction of all India, every statement he had made, and in so doing convicted Lord Lytton and his advisers of inhumanity and disregard of truth. I must quote the salient points of Lord Lytton's eulogy of Sir George Couper when acknowledging the receipt of his report traversing the allegations of Mr. Knight. He calls it a "convincing statement"; but adds that the Government of India needed no such statement to convince it that "the Lieutenant-Governor had exercised forethought in his arrangements, and had shown humanity in his orders throughout the recent crisis." The mortality which Lord Lytton "deplored" with "a deep and painful regret," in so far "as it was directly the result of famine, was caused rather by the unwillingness of the people to leave their homes than by any want of forethought on the part of the local government in providing works where they might be relieved." Lord Lytton "unhesitatingly accepts the statement of the local government that no one who was willing to go to a relief-work need have died of famine, and it is satisfactorily shown in his Honor's Minute that the relief-wage was ample." This eulogy was published on the 2d of May, 1878, after Mr. Knight had begun making his revelations in the *Statesman*. It is to be observed that there is no attempt now to deny the existence of a famine, or the fact of an appalling mortality. It was felt that in the face of Mr. Knight's statements the pretence that there was nothing out of the ordinary occurring in the Northwest must be given up. But what the policy of the Government would have been without Mr. Knight's inconvenient disclosures is apparent from an official report of Sir George Couper, dated 28th of February. At this time the people had been dying for months at the rate of many thousands a week. Over that part of the country where famine prevailed, the official mortality returns showed that the mortality was seven and eight times in excess of what it ordinarily was. It was impossible that Sir George Couper could be unacquainted with the fact. Yet he did not scruple to report to the Government of India that "it may be questioned whether it will not be found hereafter that the comparative immunity from cholera and fever which, owing apparently to the drought, the provinces have enjoyed during the past year will not compensate for the losses caused by insufficient food and clothing, and make the mortality generally little if at all higher than in an ordinary year." Left to themselves, Lord Lytton and his friends would have stoutly maintained that famine there was none, and the mortality no greater than in an ordinary year. Mr. Knight compelled them to relinquish this particular falsehood, and they fell back upon what may be called their second line. They acknowledged that there had been famine and mortality, but that the Government had foreseen and provided for every emergency; and that if, notwithstanding, a vast number of people had perished, this lamentable issue was due to the obstinate perversity with which they clung to their foodless villages, instead of availing themselves of those means of relief which a beneficent Government had abundantly provided. This statement was false on the face of it; for, as Sir George Couper had reported that there was no excessive mortality, it was ridiculous to suppose he could have adopted extraordinary measures to meet an emergency which did not exist.

Mr. Knight had charged the Government with taking no measures for the relief of the people, although it knew that the rain crops had perished, and that consequently the people had nothing to live on during the bitterly cold winter. This charge Sir George Couper affirmed to be entirely false. He writes: "In October Colonel Fraser was deputed to visit the headquarters of each division, and, in consultation with the district officers, settle what works should be undertaken to give employment to the poor when the inevitable pressure began." Then, after reciting some details, he adds: "I submit that it was not in the power of the local government to take further precautions than these in anticipation of the coming distress." This statement Lord Lytton characterizes as "a convincing statement of facts," and congratulates the Lieutenant-Governor on his "humanity" and "forethought."

Now mark the truth. Colonel Fraser, it is true, was deputed to visit the headquarters of the various districts in which it was known that the population was foodless and destitute. But it was in order to read the following extract from a letter addressed to himself by Sir George Couper:

"Please discourage relief-works in every possible way. It may be, however, that when agricultural operations are over, some of the people may want work. This, however, except on works for which there is budget provision, should only be given if the collector is satisfied that without it the people would actually starve. *Mere distress is not a sufficient reason for opening a relief-work.* And if a relief-work be started, *task-work should be rigorously exacted, and the people put on the barest subsistence-wage*, so that we may be satisfied that if any other kind of work were procurable elsewhere they would resort to it."

The spirit of these instructions is unmistakable. They were intended

to drive the people away from the relief-works. Nobody was to be relieved unless he or she was actually in a state of starvation. The consequence was that only when a man was already half-dead with hunger could he be received upon a relief-work. He then received the "barest subsistence-wage," while a full day's work was "rigorously exacted" from him. Colonel Fraser was a fit instrument for carrying these instructions into effect. He swore "that there should be no famine under his administration, and that any collector who attempted to get one up should — etc., etc." The blank space may be filled up with objurgations according to the taste and fancy of the reader. The effect of the Colonel's labors was that the people throughout the Northwest were literally starved off the relief-works. The wage allotted to each man was a little more than a penny of English money; to each woman about one penny; to each child a half-penny. But even at this rate it was found that the famine-stricken wretches clung to the works rather than face absolute want of food; and in consequence the subsistence-wage was still further reduced. Then the people in despair abandoned the works and returned to their villages to die. Having achieved this feat, the Government of India charges its victims with apathy and perversity because they perish in their homes. "No one," says Lord Lytton, "who was willing to go to a relief-work need have died of famine." He affirms this, knowing that in numberless places there were no relief-works where it was possible to obtain even Colonel Fraser's "subsistence-wage." And all this time the few who might out of their savings have lived through the period of scarcity were reduced to destitution also by the merciless exactions of this false and cruel Government.

The great length to which this letter has run compels me to break off here abruptly. But I think I have said enough to illustrate my remarks in a previous letter, that our Government of India is a gigantic system of "eye-wash." The great aim of the Government is not to remedy abuses, but keep them concealed and unknown. It is continually pretending to have accomplished that which it has not so much as attempted to do. And thus it is that difficulties and dangers have been allowed to grow up unchecked until they have become a menace to the existence of the Empire.

Correspondence.

THE INDEPENDENTS IN THE COMING CANVASS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In your issue of Sept. 11 a correspondent discusses the position of the Independents in the coming canvass. The question is certainly one of unusual interest and importance, since the two political parties are very evenly balanced, and the Independent vote is large and constantly increasing. Your correspondent "A." describes very exactly the true condition of politics at the present moment, but exception may, I think, be taken to his conclusion that a policy of quiescence is the proper one to be adopted by Independent voters. If both parties make good nominations there is, of course, no need of an Independent movement. If one party makes a good nomination, the Independent movement would also be needless. But if, and this third contingency is only too probable, both parties make bad nominations, then an Independent movement becomes essential. Suppose, for example, that the Republicans on the one hand should nominate General Grant or Mr. Blaine, and the Democrats on the other should select Mr. Tilden or Mr. Hendricks as their candidates; in such an event the condition of the Independent vote would be one of perfect helplessness, unless some attempt had been previously made to meet this state of affairs. It seems to me, therefore, that the Independents ought to organize beforehand to such an extent that, in the event of bad nominations on both sides, they would be able to come together and put up a candidate of their own.

The Fifth-Avenue Hotel conference was a failure in one sense, because as soon as the regular nominations were made the leaders rushed into one party or the other, and, abandoning all idea of holding the Independent vote together, left their followers in the lurch to look out for themselves. In another sense, however, the conference was a success. It certainly helped to force a respectable candidate upon the Republicans, if not upon the Democrats as well. It obliged both parties to bid for support by raising, instead of by lowering, the character of their candidates and the tone of their resolutions. A similar conference now would probably have a similar result. If it did not, and both parties made bad nominations, the Independent voters would then have a rallying point and an organization to fall back upon, and would be able to put up a candidate of their

own, and thus avoid throwing away their votes, besides creating a very wholesome diversion in our national politics.

By this suggestion I am far from advocating anything so chimerical as starting a third party in the present condition of politics. The only practical course for the Independents is, as a rule, to work through existing parties, and, by using one against the other in turn, force upon them the policy and measures they deem best for the country. But it would be a dismal fate not merely for the Independent voters but for the country to be left in 1880 to choose between General Grant and Mr. Tilden. A third party, or a third candidate, would then be of incalculable value. It is for this contingency that I wish the Independent voters to provide. I do not, I think, underestimate the difficulty of making such provision—on the contrary, the obstacles seem to me very great indeed; but I am satisfied that the effort ought to be made. In any event, an Independent movement would tend to raise the character of the party candidates, and it might become of the utmost importance if Democrats and Republicans, relying on their machines, insist upon giving the country a mere choice of evils.

L.

BOSTON, Sept. 20, 1879.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The references in the *Nation* of September 11 to the present political status of the Independents, or Liberals, as they were called in Michigan, seem to invite a few words on the subject from the old Northwest. A few years ago there was a large and influential element, known as Liberals—but Independents would have been a more appropriate name—in this section. They were Republicans who had become thoroughly disgusted with the infamous political methods of the Grant Administration. They were strong enough to influence local nominations; the Democrats, not then inoculated with flatism, were wise enough to adopt their suggestions in regard to platforms and candidates, and in not a few instances the Republicans encountered their first defeats. Notably was this the case in Jackson County. Nearly all of those now regarded as Independents voted for Mr. Greeley in 1872, and many of them for Mr. Tilden in 1876; but at the elections that have been held since the inauguration of President Hayes they have generally voted the Republican ticket. None of them, however, are ever chosen as delegates to conventions, and they are not, and do not wish to be, recognized as being in good and regular standing with the Republican party; they are Independents still. Every man of them is in favor of a sound currency. The Democratic party having abandoned its ancient faith in regard to the currency, and that, too, at a time when the assertion and maintenance of that faith was a patriotic duty, and having sought and effected coalitions with the Greenback faction, as long as this question was dominant in politics there was no other consistent course for the Independents to take. They have felt compelled to vote with the Republicans because the Republican party, though tainted with financial heresies, has advocated the soundest financial doctrines. It has not been clean, but it has been cleaner, of late years, than the Democratic party.

If the Democrats had made "Hard Money and Home Rule" their shibboleth, and had behaved decently in Congress, the action of many of the Independents would have been different. Of course the Solid South, the continuance of the shot-gun policy, and the rantings of red-mouthed brigadiers in Congress have had the effect to consolidate Northern sentiment, awaken war memories, and stop that disintegration of the Republican party which was taking place at a rapid rate towards the close of President Grant's Administration; but, in spite of all this suicidal conduct on the part of the Southerners, let General Grant be nominated by the Republicans next year, and a decent, honest-money candidate—like Senator Bayard, for instance—be put up by the Democrats, and not only will the old Independents assert their independence again, but they will have numerous new recruits from the Republican party. There is a widespread feeling that the Republican party deserves to be beaten, but, bad as it sometimes is, that it is not quite bad enough generally to be beaten by the Democratic party under its present management. That would be getting "out of the frying-pan into the fire."

E. W. B.

JACKSON, MICH., September 16, 1879.

THE NEW YORK REPUBLICAN TICKET.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I am much pleased with your article of September 18 entitled "The Independent Voter in the New York Election." Will you permit me to add a few further suggestions in support of your view?

1. The election this year is *exclusively* for State officers. It affects

only State interests. In choosing a governor, a comptroller, or other State officer the people *should* be influenced solely by the consideration which candidate is most likely to fulfil the duties of the office faithfully and well. Of course, in determining this question party politics cannot be entirely disregarded. Other things being equal, a Republican will prefer to vote for one of his own party. But paramount to this preference should always be the wish to promote good government in the State. The idea industriously enforced by Conkling politicians, and weakly acquiesced in by many of their opponents, that we must support Cornell now in order to ensure Republican ascendancy in 1880, has no basis in fact.

2. It has never before happened in this State, so far as I know, that all the dangerous and corrupt rings in the State are banded on one side. I say "on one side," because the support of Kelly by Democrats is so openly and evidently in the Cornell interest that no argument is necessary to show it. All the Kelly men profess to hope is to beat Robinson. Robinson can only be defeated by electing Cornell. In order to accomplish this the Tammany Ring, the Custom-house Ring, the Canal Ring, and the Insurance Ring, the latter headed by Mr. Conkling's devoted servant, John F. Smyth, are heartily and zealously co-operating. The election of Cornell means that John Kelly shall maintain absolute and undisturbed sway in the city of New York; that John F. Smyth shall be reappointed Insurance Superintendent and continue to prey upon policy-holders to maintain the Conkling ascendancy; that Jarvis Lord, Belden, and Denison, and the other magnates of canal corruption, shall be restored to the opportunities for defrauding the State from which they have for the past five or six years been cruelly excluded; and that all attempts to conduct the civil service, State or national, on honest business principles shall be abandoned, and those who have made or approved such attempts be branded, in the choice language of Senator Conkling at the Rochester Convention of 1877, as scoundrels and "mammonliners."

3. It is argued by Cornell's supporters that if Robinson shall be elected Tilden will be nominated by the Democrats for President in 1880; while if he is defeated, Tilden's chances for the Presidential nomination will be gone. Assuming this to be so, is it any reason why Independent Republicans should hesitate to go against Cornell? The Democrats must have *some* candidate. There are probably more elements of opposition to Tilden than to any other they can name. He has no qualities whatever to arouse popular enthusiasm. If the defeat of Robinson shall prevent the Democrats from nominating Tilden, it may drive them to nominate some more popular and therefore, to Republicans, more dangerous candidate. Besides, upon the question of "honest money," the most important, perhaps, that will be involved in the campaign of 1880, Mr. Tilden is himself sound. It would be better to have him elected than an avowed and earnest inflationist. But all this, upon either side of the question, is mere speculation. Our duty done to our *State* this year, it will be easier to do it to the nation in 1880. Then the questions involved will be as exclusively national as this year they are State. No State officers (except members of Assembly) are to be elected in 1880; Presidential electors and members of Congress are then to be elected.

4. Your plan of proceeding for Independent Republicans is an excellent one. I would recommend to supplement it in two respects:

1. Vote for Robinson. Your estimate of him is, in my judgment, entirely correct. He has made some mistakes. Upon some questions he has appeared to be prejudiced and narrow. But he is a ruggedly and aggressively honest man. The acts for which some of his own party have repudiated him command him to every honest citizen. I believe he has performed no official act with wrong motives or intentions.

2. Add the name of Wendell to those of Cornell and Soule for erasure. Wendell is more thoroughly identified with the Machine than any man on the ticket, except Cornell. He has been for years the most intimate political friend of John F. Smyth. He is generally believed, with Smyth, to have traded with Albany ring Democrats to defeat honest and reputable Republicans in this city. There are many other facts, some of them of public and judicial record, which indicate clearly that Mr. Wendell is an unfit man to put in charge of the State Treasury, or for a seat in the Canal Board or Board of Audit. Particulars can be given, if desired by Mr. W. or his supporters.

INDEPENDENT REPUBLICAN.

ALBANY, September 20, 1879.

GLARING WHITE PAPER.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The discussions held on education during the present session of the Congress of Social Science move me to offer, through the *Nation*, a con-

tribution to the general thought on one branch of this large subject. I believe that the eyesight of children and youth in school is injured by the intense whiteness and the high finish of the paper used in the manufacture of many of our school-books. The contrast is too great between the clear white of the paper and the blackness of the letters. The impression on the eye is not comforting, but harsh. The eye in its search is more than adequately met: it is assailed. And this suffering is aggravated often by a band of reflected light striking the eye from some part of the curved page held in the hand or lying before the reader. Our very virtues are working us mischief here. We wish the best of everything for our schools; and "what is better in a school-book than its beauty and high finish, provided the contents be all right?" we unthinkingly ask. Two things, we reply—a natural tone to the paper, and a freedom from all gloss in the finish.

A school-book in a pupil's hand is a result towards which many have made their contribution, and all the partners in this result need instruction. Perhaps publishers need it least of all, for in many cases they would make the book right were it not for the author's prejudices in favor of what is fine. The members of school-committees can hardly be expected to study more than the matter of a school-book and its most obvious attractions; and teachers often forget that a school-book should more than please—should act kindly on the pupil's eyes week after week and month after month.

ORANGE, N. J., September 13.

[We agree entirely with our correspondent in respect to the disagreeable nature of the impression produced on the eye by the highly-finished (calendered) paper which is just now in fashion. His strictures might have been extended to the gloss upon writing-paper. For all practical purposes what is called a "machine finish" (a dull surface) is greatly preferable. In respect to tinting, we would remark that a very light buff has been found, both by medical and by non-medical observers, to be the most grateful for the eye to rest upon. The notion of whiteness is one which requires to be analyzed. A natural paper, with no coloring-matter, is apt to have a shade of buff, and frequently satisfies the most sensitive and critical eye. Snellen's test-types appear to be printed on natural paper (we are not sure of the fact); and the sheet appears distinctly buff when held by the side of an ordinary newspaper. The latter, however, and a great deal of book-paper and writing-paper, are colored with indigo for the purpose of conveying the impression of perfect whiteness. The eye may feel the effect as "harsh," and the taste may be offended, but upon theoretical grounds it is hardly justifiable to condemn the addition of a bluish tint.

As regards children, the point urged by our correspondent is of value: but there is one of still greater importance—namely, the restriction of their use of books in general. If the eye-sight be protected during childhood in accordance with well-known rules, including the avoidance of long-continued application to minute objects (books, maps, fine penmanship, fine needlework), the danger of near-sight occurring in later years will be slight.—ED. NATION.]

Notes.

THE fourth part of the 'American Catalogue' completes the first volume (of Authors and Titles) with the exception of title-page and some additional matter, which will not long be delayed (A. C. Armstrong & Son). We can testify to the usefulness of this admirable work at every stage of its progress.—Thomas Whitaker announces as in press 'The Faith of our Forefathers,' a reply to Archbishop Gibbons's work on the same subject. He will also publish here the 'Simple Lessons for Home Use' and 'The Shakespeare Birthday Book,' reprinted from the English.—Lee & Shepard will publish immediately Jules Verne's new work, 'The Tribulations of a Chinaman in China,' a very modern story.—McCalla & Stavely have in preparation 'The Refutation of Darwinism; and the Converse Theory of Development, based exclusively upon Darwin's facts,' by T. Warren O'Neill, of the Philadelphia bar, who, if successful, should lose no time in changing his profession.—B. Westermann & Co. have received Parts 6 and 7 of the new edition of 'Stieler's Hand-Atlas.' Especially noticeable are the maps of India; of the West Indies proper,

including Central America; of the British Isles and the neighboring waters, and of the Northwestern United States (Plate 2 of the six-plate map of this country).—We understand that Mr. John Fiske is likely to lecture in this city during the month of December, and in the spring to repeat his visit to England in accordance with the desire of those who listened there last month to his lectures on America.—The *Athenaeum* reports the Philological Society's Dictionary as making good progress; "on some days as many as 4,000 slips from books pour in." A "Cambridge Chaucer," says the same paper, is to be edited by Mr. Henry Bradshaw, the librarian of Cambridge University, and Mr. F. J. Furnivall, the founder of the Chaucer Society, and published by Macmillan & Co. in six octavo volumes. The Clarendon Press will shortly issue a new Latin Dictionary, revised upon Andrews's Freund's, and enlarged, by two American scholars, Mr. Charlton T. Lewis and Professor Charles Short, of Columbia College.—A "Bibliography of the Writings of Charles Dickens," by James Cook, has just appeared in England, and is said to be an indispensable supplement to Forster's *Life*.—In the *Renaissance* we find high praise bestowed on a monthly bibliographic bulletin called *La Lecture*, published at Geneva, and designed for the use of families and popular institutions and libraries. Many of the reviews are written by women. It owes its existence to the local society for promoting public libraries.—In 1863 Hetzel published "Les Tricheries des Grecs dévoilées," a book in which Robert Houdin exposed the tricks of professional gamblers. This same book, with no alteration whatever, has been again brought out by Lévy, with the title changed to "L'Art de Gagner à Tous les Jeux," and without any intimation that the work is sixteen years old. Indeed, the advertisements announce it as a new book. In spite of this disingenuousness the volume may be recommended to all interested in the subject as much the best procurable.—The death is announced by cable of Eugène Emmanuel Viollet-le-Duc, the eminent French architect and antiquary, and writer on his chosen art, in the sixty-fifth year of his age. We shall take an early occasion to speak of his services at length.—In response to enquiry we give here the address of the Independent Republican Committee referred to last week: it is P. O. Box 4295, New York. We are informed, and are glad to learn, that the responses to their address have greatly exceeded their expectations; but those who desire the success of their efforts should remember that the Committee have nobody to "assess," and are quite dependent on voluntary contributions.—Two errata in our last issue (No. 742) call for prompt correction. In the last paragraph but one on p. 185 mention was made of the Russian expedition against "the Turkomans"; for which read "Tekke Turkomans." In the last paragraph on p. 187 "\$110,000" should read "£110,000."

—The dramatic unity of Mr. Henry James, Jr.'s, "Confidence" goes all to pieces in the October *Scribner's*. The leading characters are dispersed to the four quarters of the globe; the heroine has no confidence in anybody, her lover appears to lose his confidence in his friend, and the only confidence the reader can have in the ultimate re-establishment of the machinery of the story, after the two years which are supposed to intervene, lies in the dormant "property" of the Siena sketch, and in the suggestiveness of the balcony scene at the end of chapter v. But all this is very entertaining, and doubtless Mr. James is equal to his task. Prof. Lounsbury, in his second paper on "English Spelling and Reform," effectually disposes of the so-called etymological objections to reform, though when he has to expose the false etymologies suggested by corrupt spelling, criticism might be made of the statements as to how these corruptions crept in. For instance, was it on account of the analogy of *who* and *whoop*, or because he lived in Ireland, or for some other reason, that Spenser wrote *hot* "whot" in the "Faery Queene"? So far as can be judged this paper is the last of the series, but it is to be hoped not. The reform is not going to be demanded or carried by the multitude, but by the literary and scholarly guild; and what they require is not merely the removal of their prejudices—needful preliminary work, certainly—but a precise and satisfactory account of what is to take the place of the present product of the dictionary and the printing-office. Will orthography be determined by scientific or haphazard phonetics? Will, for instance, the catalog of our esteemed contemporaries the Chicago *Tribune* and the *Library Journal*, or the same word translated into Mr. Alexander Ellis's "Glossie," be the correct spelling of the future; and are editors to be commended who make lists for themselves of mutilated words for the guidance of their proof-readers and compositors? Prof. Lounsbury might also find something to say as to the value of an international congress on spelling reform, seeing that English is only the worst of the languages which are susceptible of an improved orthography; and as to the

principles on which the reformed dictionary will be constructed—that is, what shall be the standard of pronunciation.

—With mention of an acute but too short anonymous article on "Journalism as exemplified by the late Mr. Bagehot," which we commend to the Froudes and Macaulays of the press, we pass to the illustrated articles in *Scribner's*, all of which are readable and variously instructive. Mr. Ernest Ingersoll tells of life in Leadville and of the mode of mining there; Mr. Zimmermann, of "Field Sports in Minnesota"; Mr. Fox, of one of Mr. Edison's interesting non-successes in swift telegraphy; Mr. Randolph, of a sailor's experience in turning cotton-planter in a Southern wilderness—a humorous story, disproving the traditional inability of white men to endure field labor beside the negro; Miss Kate Field, of Arthur Sullivan; and Mr. Smith, in a paper on Rio de Janeiro, raises once more a warning note against the illusions of American capitalists and mechanics who send their goods or betake themselves to Brazil in the hope of profit. The portrait of Mr. Edison, by Mr. Lathrop, engraved by Juengling, and Fortuny's delicious "Piping Shepherd," engraved by Cole, are the masterpieces among the illustrations; but the editor should have spared us the poetical *affiche* to the Fortuny—

"Gone is Hellas, fane and idol,
Gone are those symmetric men
Wise to bridle," etc.

—The *Atlantic* for October is better than usual, which to its admirers is equivalent to saying that it is an excellent number. The most noteworthy articles are "Sincere Demagogery," by the author of the paper on dangerous tendencies in American life, and "Socialism in Germany," by Willard Brown. They are timely and suggestive, and they go so well together that it was worth while printing them in the same issue even at the risk of overweighting it. The former speaks of the rapid growth in this country of a class of sincere men, laborers, farmers, and even capitalists, who believe in the repeal of all laws limiting the suffrage, Government issue of paper money and control of railroads, compulsory practical education, direct taxes, chiefly on incomes; and who look for a millennium to be produced by science. This class is far more important than is generally supposed, according to the writer, because it is both intelligent and honest. Both its poorer members and those in comfortable circumstances expect the overthrow of "men of wealth and culture," the former with exultation, the others without personal feeling. But among the latter there may arise a leader, educated though despising culture, rich but denouncing wealth as the chief danger to the liberties of "the people," elegant, of spotless character and of a kindly disposition, who will press these ideas upon our unwilling attention. The speculation of the article is "legitimate" enough, and it is nothing against it perhaps that one should note the facility with which such writers speculate after having formed the habit. Mr. Brown's report as to German socialism may be summarized as an elaborate and instructive exposition of the laborer's discontent, and the belief of the educated philanthropist that socialism is a cure for it. There is an enthusiastic article on Meyerbeer by William F. Apthorp, who, however, does not blink the essentially clap-trap nature of Meyerbeer's genius, though he might object to such a statement of his qualifying criticism; "Irene the Missionary" draws near its end; "Life at a Little Court," by Sidney Hyde, is distinctly charming; Principal Shairp contributes a paper on "Burns and Scotch Song before Him," which will be read on account of its authorship; there is an admirable review of Didier's "Life and Letters of Madame Bonaparte," and the "Contributor's Club" contains an interesting account of Miss McLaughlin's discovery in pottery, which enables her to rival Haviland.

—The conclusion of Miss Olney's novel, "Through Winding Ways," in the October *Lippincott* may afford a kind of shock to readers who had come to look upon it as a "permanent feature" of the magazine, but it is as happy and satisfactory as the ending of a fairy-tale. The story is a highly-seasoned one, as may possibly be remembered; one of its characters is married four times in the course of it, her first husband dying, her second being divorced, her third shot in battle, and her fourth very much such a man as would be required to take up with such a wife; other characters and incidents are proportionately intricate. The rest of the number is of a varied and light character; Mr. Oswald has a fourth "Summerland Sketch," which is readable; Margaret Bertha Wright begins an account of "Rambles of Three," which essays humor in both text and illustrations and relates the experiences of some American artists in Italy; there is a paper on "American Landscape Gardening," by Edward C. Bruce, which would have been better if it had relied more confidently upon the interest of its subject; "The Study of English in Germany" makes the most of what it treats of and in an interesting way; "Chamois-Shoot-

ing with the Emperor of Austria" is from a capable pen, and there is a curious story of a fanatical Spanish sect in "Our Monthly Gossip" that will be new to most readers, we imagine. Its members were sworn to strangle those of their number who had received extreme unction, on the ground that they were ready for Heaven and might become less so should they by any unhappy chance recover.

—It will surprise many people, no doubt, to be told that Massachusetts is, in the matter of common-school education, "living on its past reputation," and that half of the proportionately large sum it spends for this purpose yearly is money not so much thrown away as fatally misapplied. This, nevertheless, is what Mr. Charles Francis Adams, jr., asserts in his account of a radical and successful experiment recently made by the school committee of the town of Quincy. The committee found, in 1873, that "most of the pupils who have finished the grammar course neither speak nor spell their own language very perfectly, nor read and write it with that elegance which is desirable." This was a mild statement of the results of the ordinary routine teaching in these schools, Mr. Adams says, and it is probably quite as applicable to other towns than Quincy in Massachusetts and out of it. "The whole thing was a sham," Mr. Adams exclaims of the regular school examination, in which pupils show to such apparent advantage and with the superficiality of which every one is familiar; "it was, in a word, all smatter, veneering, and cram." The committee concluded to attempt a wholly new departure. Instead of the stock superintendent, "usually some retired clergyman or local politician out of a job," they found a gentleman fresh from Germany and full of enthusiasm for teaching "as a science." They tempered his transports in one or two regards, and then gave him *carte blanche* to try his system. This system consisted in the absence of system. The number of studies was reduced in the first place. The grammar, reader, speller, and copy-book were then "hustled out." Reading at sight and writing off-hand were aimed at; "children were to learn to read and write and cypher as they learned to swim, or to skate, or to play ball." In the first two grammar grades were combined instruction in reading, writing, grammar, spelling, history, and geography. General reading, even to magazine articles, was put into the pupils' hands. The scholars read first and then wrote of what they had read. Spelling came with practice, just as walking and talking do. In short, the system introduced was "a complete negation of the whole present common-school system." Of course this "seemed to take away the breath of the old-time masters," but its results were, according to Mr. Adams, excellent. "Not only was there a marked improvement in attendance, but the attendance was cheerful." The children could read at sight and could write a simple letter easily, although not one in ten knew what a noun was, for example. The cost of the improved instruction was one-fifth less than the old had been. There are probably few patriotic people who will not be interested in Mr. Adams's account of this revolution, of which we have space to give but a meagre outline—as he says, Americans believe the common schools to be "the ark of the national salvation." Accordingly we refer our readers to the little pamphlet, which Estes & Lauriat have just published, wherein Mr. Adams has collected this essay and two others germane in subject, under the title 'The Public Library and the Common Schools: Three Papers on Educational Topics.'

—Several things should be borne in mind, however, in reading Mr. Adams's paper. The Quincy experiment was tried under unusually favorable conditions. The committee were in effect a commission, and they evidently enjoyed the confidence of their tax-paying townsmen in an unusual degree; they were not subject to removal before they had fairly tested their plan, to be succeeded by another committee inimical to it. They were peculiarly fortunate in their selection of a superintendent. It is probable that their teachers were better than the average, and had a certain elasticity and adaptability. It is still more probable that they were themselves men of acumen, experience, and public spirit. Furthermore, they were pioneers, and naturally possessed of a wholesome zeal. Moreover, the method enhances the importance of the teacher greatly—with text-books abolished, everything, indeed, may be said to depend upon the ability and aptitude of the teacher. Such a superintendent as Mr. Parker could doubtless teach teachers how to teach. But supposing the Quincy method introduced into the schools of this city by the Board of Education, would Superintendent Kiddle be competent to supervise the details of reformation? Still, the adoption of any measure which would illustrate to the Board of Education Superintendent Kiddle's exact capacities would perhaps be worth trying.

—The death is announced by cable of the Rev. Dr. Joseph P. Thomp-

son, formerly of this city, at Berlin on Saturday, in the sixty-first year of his age. Dr. Thompson was a native of Philadelphia, but acquired his early reputation as pastor of the Broadway Tabernacle, and as one of the first editors of the *Independent*. In consequence of the sudden failure of his health he withdrew from his charge in 1872, with every mark of esteem and confidence on the part of his congregation, and went to Germany to live, having especially in view the quiet pursuit of his studies in Egyptology, to which he was greatly devoted. He took, however, an active part in numerous international congresses at Brussels, Antwerp, Paris, and elsewhere, for the codification of the law of nations, the regulation of trade, the furtherance of geographical research, etc., and delivered many addresses on America during the centennial year. It is, indeed, remarkable that his powers were not sooner exhausted. Dr. Thompson was a frequent and valued contributor to the *Nation*, beginning with the second number, and the relation suffered no interruption from his residence abroad. Besides what he wrote for newspapers and reviews his published works are numerous, but of these a few memoirs of deceased friends will perhaps be the most enduring. That on which he was engaged at the time of his death is said to have related to the Hebrews in Egypt.

—The French National Library has just issued, as a supplement of fourteen pages to its "August bulletin," a list of the American books collected for the library by M. Em. Terquem during his late visit to this country. The books are all gifts from various libraries, publishers, and from the Departments of Government. The most noteworthy fact about the list is, that the first library in France, and the largest library in the world, should not have advanced beyond the primitive, and one might say bibliophilic, style of cataloguing the books issued by institutions under the first word of the title. In this list the publications of the United States are scattered all through the alphabet, according as they are Reports, Acts, Regulations, Schedules, Revised Regulations, Treatises, Notices, Patent Laws, Monthly Reports, Memoranda, Lists. A worse practice could not be devised.

—M. Édouard Fournier, the French antiquarian and dramatic critic, has just published a fifth edition, revised and considerably enlarged, of his little book on 'L'Esprit des Autres.' M. Fournier is to be treated rather as a dealer in literary bric-à-brac than as a serious historian. His 'Vieux-Neuf,' or ancient history of modern inventions and discoveries, is a pell-mell gathering of the interesting and the worthless. His 'L'Esprit dans l'Histoire' has provided Mr. Hayward with the text and with much of the matter of one of his most entertaining essays, in which we were shown how little reliance was to be placed on the generally received anecdotes and popular sayings attributed to the celebrities of the past. 'L'Esprit des Autres' is akin in subject and style to this. It contains four hundred rambling pages about quotations, either in French or in Greek and Latin, the only other languages most Frenchmen take any interest in. It is not a regular dictionary of quotations like Mr. Bartlett's, but an ample index of passages cited fills twenty pages at the end of the book, and gives it value as a work of reference. M. Fournier fills his first chapter with a discussion of the good and evil of quoting. Perhaps unaware of Emerson's essay and Sterne's remark about all modern literature being a pouring from one vessel into another—a remark which has been traced to Burton's 'Anatomy'—he quotes a passage of Châteaubriand in which Socrates is cited as saying that he was, as it were, a vase filling himself with water at strange fountains for the benefit of those who heard him. He also gives us a criticism of Bayle's to the effect that a certain work was "loaded with so many quotations that they interfere and keep us from seeing the author's own work"; and this reminds M. Fournier of the song of the peasant lost in Paris and crying out:

"La hanteur des maisons
Empêch' de voir la ville" (p. 2).

for a parallel to which see one of the numberless stanzas of the primitive Yankee Doodle. We noticed recently the letters of Ducis. M. Fournier shows us here (p. 257) that that dramatist put Goldsmith under contribution as well as Shakspere, turning the familiar

"Man wants but little here below,
Nor wants that little long,"

into the feebler Alexandrine,

"Il faut si peu pour l'homme, et pour si peu de temps."

Mr. Tennyson's declaration of the real faith which may exist in honest doubt has a French parallel in Mme. Deshoulières'

"Vous ne pronvez que trop que chercher à connaître
N'est souvent qu'apprendre à douter" (p. 90).

which M. Fournier cites only to compare with Dante's

"Che non men che saver, dubbiar m'aggrata" (*Inferno*, xi. 93).

M. Fournier gives few instances of apter use of a quotation than Théophile Gautier's application to the then recently discovered photography of Virgil's

"... Solem qui dicere falsum
Audeat?" (*Georgics*, i. 463).

GREEN'S PURITAN ENGLAND.*

"PURITANISM," to use a happy expression of Mr. Green's, "missed its aim." The problem for an historian is to account for the fact that a great religious and political party struggled, conquered, triumphed, and fell with a fall from which it never throughout the course of English history rose again. The puzzle is the more perplexing by reason of the contrast between the fate of French and of English republicanism. The democrats of the French Revolution were men of very moderate ability. To compare Roland, Danton, or Robespierre with Pym, Hampden, or Cromwell is simply ridiculous. The French leaders were men who at the best grasped the readiest, the most obvious, the most violent, and therefore the worst, means for accomplishing their objects. If insane panic affords some excuse for the cruelty, the plea of fear condemns the whole policy, of the Terrorists. Their rule was the rule of brute force directed by fear, and the Reign of Terror is a monument as much of human folly as of human cruelty. The Puritan leaders were men of whom any country might be proud. A loyalist might admit that Cromwell needed but the title to the throne to have been the greatest of English monarchs. The memories of the Terror filled even liberals with horror, and converted every man of sense throughout Europe into a conservative. The Commonwealth was a period to which every Englishman might look back with national pride. It might, therefore, have been expected that the prestige of the French Republic would have perished, whilst the glories of the Commonwealth would have ensured the prolonged existence of a Republican or of a Cromwellian party.

Events exactly disappointed natural expectation. After a century French Republicanism is alive. Robespierre is the saint of a political sect. The name of Napoleon is still a power. The calamities of the Revolution did not conciliate France to the Ancien Régime, and the enquiry raised by De Tocqueville, "comment la nation, en cessant d'être républicaine, était restée révolutionnaire," still remains a perplexity to historians. No similar question needs the attention of those who study the great Rebellion. Neither the Commonwealth nor Cromwell was accepted by England. If affection for the Stuarts accelerated the fall of the Commonwealth, detestation for James II. gave no new life to Puritanism. The traditions of the Protectorate, as well as republican enthusiasm, proved within thirty years of Cromwell's death to be as dead as the institutions of William the Conqueror. The problem of English history (if one may adapt the expressions of De Tocqueville to totally different circumstances) is, how it happened that the nation remained attached to freedom without ever adopting the principles of the Puritan revolution? The author who answers this enquiry will have thrown as much light on the history of England as De Tocqueville has cast on what may be termed the theory of French history. We cannot say that Mr. Green has explained the enigma of Puritanism, but we can assert that his book supplies ideas and materials which go a great way towards suggesting the kind of answer of which the problem is capable. His strength does not lie in analysis, but he exhibits an impartiality not to be found in either the assailants or the admirers of Puritanism; and this spirit of fairness, combined with rare literary gifts, enables him to set forth the general circumstances under which Puritanism arose, flourished, and declined, and thus to make a great step towards explaining its failure. The aim of this article is to state briefly the general conclusions which Mr. Green suggests in reference to the causes why Puritanism missed its aim.

Two considerations of a general character are apt to escape students of the seventeenth century. The first is that the hour of the Puritan triumph was not in reality the time when Puritanism had its greatest influence. In 1603 England might be fairly termed a Puritan country. Calvinism was the prevailing, and so to speak the received, creed of the Church. Opposition to arbitrary power was, though in a much less distinct way, the predominant political feeling of the nation. If we might be allowed the use of expressions which are admittedly inaccurate and involve an anachronism, but which nevertheless convey a distinct idea to modern readers, we should say that the people were, when James I.

came to the throne, in religion Calvinistic Evangelicals, and in politics constitutional Whigs. These terms are, of course, inaccurate; but what ought to be noted is, that in religion, at least, the doctrines which afterwards became associated with an extreme party were the creed of the mass of religious Englishmen. The High-Church movement or revival under Laud, together with the parallel movement in favor of despotism under Strafford, were revolutionary—i.e., they were attacks on the predominant sentiment of the nation. If this be so, as we think would be admitted by writers so little enthusiastic for Puritanism as, say, Dean Hook or Mr. Gardiner, the result follows that Puritan influence reached its height at any rate before Charles ascended the throne, and that the influences of various kinds had, even before the outbreak of the Civil War, begun to turn what had been the tide of Puritanism.

Mr. Green brings out forcibly the extent to which literature and science gradually undermined some of the assumptions on which the influence of Calvinism rested. Dates are in such a matter often more instructive than comment. Chillingworth was born 1602 and died 1644. In 1642 Hobbes published his *De Cive*. Locke was born 1634; Newton in 1642. Before the Puritans had accomplished their triumph the intellectual movement of the world had taken a turn which menaced the Calvinistic ideal of religion, and with it the Calvinistic ideal of government. One further date is of immense importance: the Peace of Westphalia was concluded in 1648. A year later Charles I. was executed. The Puritans achieved their triumph almost at the moment when the deadly struggle between Roman Catholicism and Protestantism, which almost gave life to the enthusiasm of Puritanism, ended in a drawn battle. The fervor of English Protestantism inevitably cooled when the perils and the triumphs of foreign Protestantism came to an end. A second consideration closely connected with the first is that the great Rebellion was a conservative movement which, mainly through the incapacity of Charles I., was turned into a revolution. This is the essential contrast between the English and the French revolutions. Englishmen took up arms intending, at least, to preserve existing institutions in church and state. Frenchmen rose against the monarchy because they detested every institution which existed. "They made," writes De Tocqueville, "the greatest effort which any people ever engaged in to cut, so to speak, the thread of their destiny in two, and to separate by an abyss that which they had been up to 1789 from that which they wished to be thenceforward." Neither nation entirely succeeded. Englishmen, while wishing to preserve, in reality changed far more than they intended the spirit of their constitution. France has retained until this day many of the principles of the Ancien Régime. What, however, is noticeable for our purpose is that the revolutionary element in Puritanism was foreign to the spirit of the national opposition to Charles. One fact, which no writer with whom we are acquainted has made so prominent as Mr. Green, curiously illustrates the conservatism of the movement. All parties, including even the Independents, wished to negotiate with Charles when a prisoner. The key to the curious intrigues while he was a captive lies in the wish of every party in the state to secure its objects by acting in alliance with the king. By honest adherence to any clear policy he might, probably, have saved not only his life but his throne; he perished not because he was a tyrant whom every one detested, but because he turned out a liar whom nobody could trust.

These general considerations go far towards explaining the weakness of the Puritan position even when it seemed strongest. Still, the question why a powerful government such as that of Cromwell could not conciliate, if not the good-will of the nation, at least the adherence of a party as strong as that which, after the revolution of 1688, upheld Whig principles till they became the principles of the whole nation, requires an answer. The reply which Mr. Green's history at least suggests is, that the political failure of Puritanism, though depending partly upon circumstances, such as the shortness of Cromwell's rule—the Protectorate lasted from 1653 to 1658—was mainly attributable to want of far-sighted statesmanship, and to the inherent weakness of a political system depending for support on religious enthusiasm.

Detractors of the Protector have in modern times done his reputation an unintentional service. To treat a man as a hypocrite and a buffoon who turns out when his character is fairly surveyed to have been zealous for the faith he held, and also one of the most eminent rulers who has ever governed a great country, is the sure way to raise up a class of worshippers who will deem him a saint and a statesman of heroic mould. With Cromwell's religious character we are not concerned, nor is there at this time of day much reason for rebutting the idle charge of hypocrisy. With his statesmanship it is more easy to deal, and here critics are apt to

* History of the English People. By J. R. Green. Vol. ill. Puritan England. London and New York: Macmillan & Co.

overlook the fact that a man may be a ruler of men, may have insight into character, administrative capacity, the vigor which seizes opportunities for action or meets emergencies with energy and with coolness, and yet not possess originality of conception or statesmanlike foresight. It is here that Cromwell, compared of course, as he must be, not with ordinary but with extraordinary rulers, falls short of the highest standard. He was a great monarch; he was not a great statesman. He fined the malignants, but he did not confiscate their estates; that is to say, he kept alive bitter hostility without taking the means to conciliate zealous support. If the soldiers who were settled in Ireland had obtained lands in England, a certain number of Englishmen would have felt a hatred even more bitter than that which they in fact entertained to the rule of Cromwell; but the Protectorate would have obtained supporters who would have withstood a restoration to the death. Even if settling the army in England was in fact impossible, the policy of placing the most zealous soldiers of Puritanism in Ireland certainly is open to the gravest objections, if regarded as a measure for supporting the revolutionary cause. The war with Spain was the pursuit, no doubt, of a traditional policy, but it was a policy out of date and of dubious expediency. The attempt to form a great Protestant alliance seems also symptomatic of the adherence to ideas which were appropriate to the time of Cromwell's youth rather than to that of his power. The impatience of his dealing with parliamentary opposition when placed side by side with his obvious, and it must be added perfectly statesmanlike, desire to give a legal character to his rule, argues not indeed want of foresight but a lack of that perfect self-control which is the sure characteristic of a statesman. The most curious point, however, in Cromwell's whole conduct is the failure clearly to designate a successor, and the letting the government fall, under a doubtful nomination, into the hands of a son whom he had no reason to hold competent to wield authority. Unless, what is by no means impossible, he trusted to the last in Providence's extending his life, there is a good deal of difficulty in reconciling his conduct, in respect of his successor, either with statesmanship or with Cromwell's undoubtedly high public spirit.

If faults of policy, not only on the part of the Protector but also on the part of his republican opponents, afford one half of the solution of the problem why Puritanism ended in failure, a large part, if not the whole, of the remainder of the explanation is supplied by the nature of religious enthusiasm. Cromwell has always been greatly commended, even by those who hate his name and disbelieve in his sincerity, for his insight in perceiving that the zeal of Cavalier loyalty could be met only by appealing to the still stronger sentiment of religious enthusiasm; and no doubt the commendation is deserved. The "New Model" routed the royal armies, and it may well be doubted whether anything but a force like the "New Model" could have ensured the victory of the Parliament. But when the policy of Cromwell is commended, its defects, looked at as a mere stroke of statesmanship, must not be forgotten. Religious zeal is the strongest of all the forces by which men can be driven to action. While it lasts it is all but unconquerable. The enthusiasm, however, of religion has its own laws. It ebbs and flows in obedience to rules which are not the rules of earthly policy. The wind blows where it listeth. To say this is not to deny the reality of religious fervor. It is rather to assert that such zeal, just because it is true and genuine, cannot be permanently used in support of political schemes or constitutions. The spirit which at one moment impels an army to victory leaves them at another unable to resist opposition which seems the decree of fate or Providence. Bunyan will be for ever the type of the Puritan soldier, but the zeal of George Fox was no less sincere and no less overpowering than the zeal of Bunyan. The army of saints who divided the spoil at Marston Moor were of the same spirit, and in part the same men, as the soldiers who stood grimly on Blackheath to witness Charles II.'s return, and surrendered the control of the state without an attempt at armed resistance. In each case they obeyed the impulse of religion. It is hard to say whether they were more to be admired in their victory or in their fall. In both, however, they bore witness to the fact that the fluctuating sentiment of religious zeal is not a foundation on which to rest a permanent fabric of statesmanship.

THE COMÉDIE-FRANÇAISE.*

THE Comédie-Française and the scarcely more august Academy share the honor and the good fortune of being the only institutions of the

monarchy which have survived the overthrow of their creator. The former is the direct descendant in unbroken line of the company of comedians which Molière led back to Paris, and which after his death, in 1673, drew to itself the two rival troupes. M. Francisque Sarcey, the acute dramatic critic of the *Temps*, and the author of "Comédiens et Comédiennes," contributed to the July *Nineteenth Century* an admirable article on the Théâtre-Français, in the course of which he asks :

" Do you know that between Got and Molière there are only seven or eight names of great actors? We have, so to speak, only to stretch out our hand to be able, across several generations, to find the first *Mascarille*. Got played a long time with Monrose, who had seen Dazincourt. Dazincourt appeared young by the side of Prévile, already old. Prévile had known Poisson, who is the last link of the chain up to Molière. In this way the tradition has been preserved alive from one great actor to another. One feels how such or such a rôle was played in the days of Molière, and when by chance the interpretation is changed by the caprice of an actor, as happened in the case of *Arnolphe*, whose character was modified by *le p're Provost*, that change forms a date and the new tradition is established, unless the successors of Provost reject it. Here we see the distinctive mark of the Comédie-Française, which unites to tradition a wise spirit of innovation that corrects and harmonizes it to the tastes of the day, but at the same time, out of respect for tradition, it always puts the bridle on this taste for novelty. The history of the Comédie-Française is only a perpetual compromise between these two contrary forces."

During these two centuries of existence the Comédie-Française has always been a republic, a commonwealth having at times a protector imposed by the higher authority which had organized it. In Molière's day, as in Shakspere's, it was the custom for the chief actors of a theatrical company to share in the risks and profits of management. This custom the Théâtre-Français alone, of all French or English theatres, has kept up. A young graduate of the Conservatory, who has taken a first prize, has the right to an appearance on the stage of the Théâtre-Français. He is engaged at a salary by the year. If in time he should show marked ability and give promise of becoming capable one day of playing the best parts of his line of business, he may be elected an associate—that is, a sharer in the management, in the profits, and in the responsibilities of the enterprise. But there are always more sharers than there are shares: there are generally twenty-two *Sociétaires*, while there are never twenty shares available for this purpose. The young actor or actress begins, therefore, with an eighth or a quarter of a share, rising gradually as his value to the theatre increases and vacancies are made by death or resignation to a half, and finally to a whole share. M. Coquelin, the brilliant comic actor, was an associate for five years before he had a full share. Since M. Perrin has been the director of the theatre the yearly yield of a share has been rapidly rising; in 1878 each full share paid a profit of forty thousand francs. As, however, the theatre may not make money, and the shares may be of no value whatsoever, each associate gets an annual salary proportionate to his merits, but much smaller than he would receive elsewhere. After a certain number of years of service he may retire on a pension, varying in amount as he may have been of more or less value to the company. Certain of the profits are diverted each year to accumulate for the associate when he retires: M. Bressant, for instance, when he withdrew from active service received a lump-sum of eighty thousand francs, and is receiving an annual pension of eight or ten thousand more. The chance of profit is increased by the fact that the society has its theatre from the Government rent free, and its pensions are made certain by the ample Government subsidy and by slowly-accumulated reserve funds. Besides his salary each actor is paid a certain small sum every time he acts: thus the most useful and the most industrious are better paid than the lazy and less competent, and thus, too, the actor hesitates before refusing even an inferior part in a play which may be acted numberless times. In English and American theatres an actor is justified in refusing to play an unimportant part, as the public, seeing him in it night after night for perhaps six months, may forget that he is capable of better things; but at the Français the same piece is rarely played on two successive evenings and never on three, and the actor who plays a poor part to-night knows that the next night he may have a better, or perhaps the best. This feeling leads to a generally higher level of acting; it gets more good players into one piece than is often possible with us. The duties of the stage-manager, by the way, are divided among certain of the elder male associates, who assume them for a week at a time; and for thus acting as *semainier* they get additional allowances.

The influence of the pernicious "star system" is so strong with us in America and in England that the London papers, commenting on the recent performances of the Comédie-Française in London, again and

* *Journal Intime de la Comédie-Française (1852-1871)*, publié par Georges d'Heyll. Pp. xii. 506. Paris : E. Dentu ; New York : F. W. Chistern. 1879.

again spoke of Mlle. Sarah Bernhardt as the "leading lady," and of M. Febvre or M. Mounet-Sully appearing "in support" of her. No terms could well be less exact. Mlle. Bernhardt is not a superior, therefore her comrades do not appear "in support"; she is not even the leading lady: she is simply an associate of the Comédie-Française. On the playbills the names of the actors appear in the order of their election as associates, the salaried actors following their seniors; in "Ruy Blas," for instance, the name of Mlle. Bernhardt, who plays the *Queen*, is preceded by that of Mlle. Jouassain, who acts the far less important part of the *Duenna*, because Mlle. Jouassain was elected an associate in 1863, and so is the senior of Mlle. Bernhardt, elected in 1875. There are no stars at the Théâtre-Français, partly because the associates are all "stars," and partly because any individual prominence would break up the artistic unity which is the great beauty of the present organization. Rachel in her day was a "star," and the experience then gained will keep the Théâtre-Français from ever repeating it. As M. Sarey says: "Rachel cost the theatre more than she ever drew, and she did more harm to art than she rendered it service. . . . The nights on which she played the receipts amounted to 10,000 francs, the whole of which went into her pocket. The next night the theatre was empty." M. d'Heylli gives us the annual gross receipts of the theatre for the past thirty years: while Rachel acted they varied from about 300,000 francs to 900,000 (in 1855, the exhibition year); from her death in 1858 to the war of 1870 they never fell below 800,000; after the war and the Commune they jumped to 1,262,000 in 1872, and rose steadily to 1,580,000 in 1877.

It will readily be seen that an institution as conservative as the Théâtre-Français is likely to take little initiative in bringing out new authors. Its function is not to discover new dramatists and lead in dramatic progress, but to consecrate and reward acknowledged merit. Many of the plays which it now presents with great success were originally produced at other theatres—among them are the "Cigüe" and the "Gendre de M. Poirier" of M. Augier, and the "Demi-Monde" and "Fils Naturel" of M. Dumas. These and many other plays of a literary character won success elsewhere—a success which the Comédie-Française ratifies by taking them to itself. Its company is so much stronger than that of any other theatre of Paris, or even of any two others, that it is sure to act the piece better than it was originally acted. It aims at a perfect performance of the masterpieces of French dramatic literature, old and new. The best plays of Molière, Racine, Corneille, and Beaumarchais are always in readiness, and are frequently performed. As the bill is changed nightly, a week rarely passes without one or more opportunities of seeing a classic drama, comic or tragic. A successful new play, like M. Augier's "Fourchambault" or M. Dumas's "Étrangère," is acted at first three or four times a week; then, as its attraction lessens, it is seen but twice or even once a week. It does not finally drop out of the bill sometimes for two or three years, and it may then at any time be revived for another series of performances. It takes much longer for a play to attain its hundredth performance at the Français than elsewhere, but there a good play is above the chances of ill-luck, sickness of an actor, temporary lack of public interest, and so on, which beset it at other theatres. As the new play alternates with the play of last year and of the year before, and as these alternate with the plays of two centuries ago, standards of comparison are supplied, and it is easier to judge a piece at its true value. The Théâtre-Français is, in fact, a museum of dramatic art, and as such it is fostered by the Government. The subsidy is intended especially to provide for the proper performance of the classic drama, which has rarely been able to attract paying audiences. But the present director, M. Perrin, has been skilful enough to make Molière and Racine fashionable, and, therefore, as profitable as the latest new work of M. Augier or M. Dumas.

M. d'Heylli's volume, which has served as the text of these remarks upon a subject made timely by the great attention justly paid to the Comédie-Française by the English public and press, and abundantly echoed by our papers, is a journal of the doings of the company during the Second Empire (1852-1870). The author, to whom we already owe an admirable edition of Beaumarchais's dramatic works and also model monographs on M. Regnier, M. Bressant, and Mme. Arnould-Plessy, published as they retired from the stage, begins by giving us a description of the Comédie-Française as it stood at the end of 1852, from which we see that M. Arsène Houssaye was then the director and that Offenbach was the leader of the orchestra—a post no longer in existence, as the theatre has now no orchestra. After this we then find, under dates, accounts of each new play with its cast, of each first appearance, of each revival, of each resignation or vacancy caused by

death, supported by frequent extracts from contemporary criticism; Jules Janin, Théophile Gautier, and M. Francisque Sarey being constantly drawn upon. In the course of the journal we have eclectic criticism and biographic details of nearly all the leading dramatists of France, and of all the members of the Comédie-Française. In an appendix are given a table of the performances in Paris of Rachel, a summary of the career of the theatre since 1846, with the gross annual receipts, and a description of the present Comédie-Française, interesting to compare with that which opens the volume. From these details it is evident that M. d'Heylli's book is valuable to the student of the contemporary French stage, and that it is useful as a work of reference to all who take any interest in the drama of the day. Its value for the latter purpose is greatly increased by an ample index of plays and persons, covering nearly eleven double-column pages.

PLANT ARCHAEOLOGY.*

II.

AS we have seen, the vegetable world has had an eventful history, and this history Count Saporta undertakes to reconstruct from ancient and authentic documents.

These documents have settled one point with certainty, viz., that the great changes in the temperature of the polar regions have not resulted from any change in the earth's axis of rotation, such as certain physical geologists have supposed. That this has remained steady throughout the whole period in question is as good as proved by the identity of the miocene and other tertiary fossil plants in all longitudes, from the Mackenzie River and Alaska round to Spitzbergen, Iceland, and Greenland—in part the same species, in all the same or equivalent combinations. Not indeed the same species in the same latitude any more than now, but such latitudinal distribution as to show that the curvatures of the miocene isotherms were quite analogous to those of the present age. Moreover, the monotony which characterizes the sub-polar vegetation of the present day—when the most of the species and the combinations of species occur all round the world—equally characterized it then when clothed with forest trees of a temperate zone.

Upon the data in hand, now much extended, and on the supposition that the same species of tree has not appreciably altered meanwhile in its relations to temperature, Heer long ago elaborately compared the miocene climates with those of our time, and Saporta corroborates his conclusions. For the northern regions the difference is said to be equivalent to 25 or 30 degrees of latitude—that is, we have now, say in Europe, in latitude 40° and 45°, and in Atlantic America, in latitude 38° to 40°, the temperature and the vegetation which then flourished at latitude 70° in Greenland. Grinnell Land, in latitude 82°, only two hundred leagues from the pole, had a forest of coniferous trees; among them—associated with a poplar-tree, a hazel, and a birch—was the silver fir of Europe, and the bald cypress of the swamps of the Southern United States. The same combination, minus the cypress, must now be sought in the more elevated parts of Central and Southern Germany. The sequoias and magnolias and persimmons of Greenland, in latitude 70°, mingled with maples, oaks, and grape-vines, have their representatives partly in Virginia and on the Ohio River, partly in California. The miocene of the southern shore of the Baltic had laurels, oleanders, and camphor-trees, but no palms, so far as is known, thus answering to the Mediterranean flora, but miocene palms reached to Belgium and Bohemia; and Provence, on similar data, had then about the climate of the coast of Zanzibar.

Another conclusion which Saporta confidently reaches—and which indeed is reached from all sides—is that of a very moist quaternary climate. Looking back to this comparatively recent period from our own, everywhere the streams have dwindled. Through great river-beds shrunken streamlets now meander in insignificant channels; springs reach the surface much lower down the valleys than of old; and the "rivers without water" of Egypt and Syria, and the reduced level of the Dead Sea, are so many evidences of a dryness supervening upon a general humidity greatly in excess of the present. These fuller water-courses of themselves indicate a more temperate or mean climate, a more equal distribution of heat and cold through the year. Was this equable climate frigid and rigorous or comparatively mild? Were Europe and the United States simply arctic and to be compared with present Greenland and Spitzbergen, as the school of Agassiz maintains? Or should the

* "Le Monde des Plantes avant l'apparition de l'Homme. Par le Comte de Saporta. Avec 13 Planches, dont 5 in couleur et 110 figures dans le texte." Pp. 416, 8vo. Paris: Masson; New York: F. W. Christern. 1879.

comparison rather be made with Southern New Zealand, where tree-ferns almost overhang the terminal moraines of existing glaciers, in a climate which is neither cold nor warm? Saporta maintains the latter, and he is not alone. He insists that the high Alps and the Pyrenees are not the types of glacial Europe generally; that the arctic animals and plants, and the rigorous climate which we associate with these, belonged only to the close neighborhood of glaciers, but that the valleys below enjoyed a climate even milder than now, although vastly more humid. So, likewise, Mr. Ball (in a lecture recently delivered before the Royal Geographical Society of Great Britain) ventures to affirm that, even during the period of maximum cold, the highest ridges of the Alps were not completely covered with snow and ice; for we still see, by the appearance of the surface, the limit above which the ancient ice did not reach; and in the middle zone the slopes that rose above the ancient glaciers had a summer climate not very different from that which now prevails. And he concludes that the effect on the growth of plants in the Alps was to lower the vertical height of the zones of vegetation only one or two thousand feet.* This would seriously affect the forests of Europe, but would not permanently disturb the alpine and subalpine vegetation.

Yet cold it must have been when the reindeer and musk-ox roamed over the plains of Central Europe, and when the elephant or mammoth, and even the rhinoceros which accompanied them, were equally clad with a thick coat of hair. But, says Saporta, with the remains of these very animals from which a frigid arctic climate is inferred, occur also, in the alluvia of the Somme and the Seine, those of an elephant nearly related to the Indian species, the hippopotamus of the African rivers, and the hyena of the Cape; and the vegetable remains include the laurel of the Canaries along with the vine. The trees of the same epoch farther north were pines, lindens, maples, and oaks. So, according to Saporta, even the glacial period formed only a seeming interruption to the general course, the steady and really unbroken diminution of terrestrial temperature from the earliest geological periods to the present. This must be admitted if the two classes of animals and plants—those adapted to cold and those to warmer climates—were really contemporaneous. Our geologists have maintained that they were not, but that climates have oscillated, and that warmer periods than ours intervened between the glacial epoch and the present, or were intercalated in the glacial period itself. But is not the distinction of periods an assumption for explaining the two kinds of fossil remains?

We need not enter here into the discussion of the cause of the higher temperature of ancient climates, and of that peculiar and temporary state of things attending and originating the glacial epoch, with which Saporta concludes his third chapter. And no space is left us in which to sketch even the outlines of the second part and main staple of his book, the history of the vegetable periods, beginning with the "primordial marine plants" of the Laurentian and closing with the pliocene, in which existing trees are everywhere identified. The general conclusion of these very rich, elaborate, and well-considered chapters is that the vegetation of the earth has been continuous through all ages, and that the explanation of the present is found in the past. The history of the genus *Sequoia*—of the two "big trees of California"—as recently sketched by Heer in a popular journal, *Das Ausland*, is a fair illustration of this. The difference between these two trees is as notable as their resemblance and their isolation. They are the survivors of a numerous family, of wide distribution, which is first recognized in the cretaceous formation, in several species, and which reached its maximum in the middle tertiary, in fourteen recognizable species or forms. Almost from the first these separate into two groups, one foreshadowing the coast, the other the sierra, redwood, yet with various intermediate forms. These intermediate species are extinct, the two extreme forms have survived. The likeness of these two trees is explained by their genealogy, their marked difference by the extinction of the connecting forms which in earlier times bridged the interval.

RECENT NOVELS.†

IT must be a robust admiration for M. Zola which survives the reading of such books as 'The Rougon-Macquart Family.' His own susceptibilities may endure the unrelieved odiousness of his characters, but his readers require some training for the steady contemplation of organizations only less guilty because more diseased, of moral baseness unvaried by even a gleam of rectitude, of evil inheritance which is fatal, the whole

* But Mr. Ball is fairly astounding when he assumes that our arctic-alpine flora may have been the flora of high mountains at low latitudes in the carboniferous period.

† 'The Rougon-Macquart Family.' By Emile Zola. Translated by John Stirling. Philadelphia: T. B. Peterson & Bros.

developing itself in a social condition which offers stimulus and means to the wicked, but neither help nor suggestion of anything better as possible. The old strife of Ormuzd and Ahriman is in the dim past, and the evil spirit has conquered. We are warned against judging the French people by their literature; what are we to infer when such an aspect of human life is the result of so able a man's observation and conviction? We see that some persons find the loves of Miette and Silvère a gleam of light across the darkness of the story, but considering Silvère's unhealthy excitability and the unsoundness, so to speak, of both, the light is faint. The book begins the history of a family who illustrate various vices and diseases in their own persons, and bequeath complicated evil to their descendants. These in their turn are specimens of what the coarsest vice can make of human beings, and from these threads M. Zola spins his web. The *Coup d'état* is copied in miniature in the little town of Plassons, and one cannot but suspect that the author has greater people in his mind as he describes in detail the falsity, the cowardice, the murderous gluttony of those who find themselves at the top, when all is quiet again.

A complete and, to many people doubtless, a refreshing contrast is M. Theuriet's last book. M. Theuriet is rather an optimist; his view of life suggests gay ribbons and holiday jollity in the main, and though it has its shadows they are not very sombre. But he is very much of a poet, and in an idyllic story like 'Young Maugars' is at his best. The love-making is very charming and done with great delicacy. It quite atones for M. Theuriet's *naïf* blundering in painting a villain of a deliberate and frank execrability with which M. Zola, who knows villains to their finger-tips, would never think of enduing his worst character. An exception to this criticism, however, which is worth pointing out for the subtle art with which a thoroughly corrupt nature is exhibited, is the scene between young Maugars and Mlle. Marcelle. Mlle. Marcelle is very real; you see the evil in her at the same time that you are conscious of her charm. The book is excellent for its contrast between the virtues of the peasants and the vices of the *bourgeoisie* in a small French town, and for its many pleasant pictures of out-of-doors. These, though they give a somewhat episodical character to the story, are in a subdued key, and, since they are by their author, they are admirable in technique.

'Left-handed Elsa' is an honest little story in excellent print. It has an odd mixture of reality and *diablerie*; but just that is attractive to some people, and homely honesty and truth at last win the day.

'The Breton Mills' comes near to being a really powerful story. The author calls it a romance, and therefore, we suppose, disallows beforehand being called to a strict account for knowledge of human nature or probable succession of events; but it is a pity, since he has experience and ability to do as well as he does in the earlier part of the book, that he should not have bestirred himself to do a really good piece of work. As it is, the story is like a chimera, which begins with a human figure and ends in arabesque. The Breton Mills are apparently woollen mills, owned entirely by one man. There are a thousand work-people in these mills, and the interest of the book consists in the exposition of the poverty of the operatives and the imperious will of the owner—one aspect of the strife between labor and capital. There are powerful pieces of description. The burning of the mill, with the varying instincts and influences acting on the operatives, who could have saved it but do not, is very dramatic, and the cautious endeavor to deal justly and kindly on the part of Philip Breton, when he inherits the mill property, with the early gratitude and subsequent discontent of "the hands," is well described; but the heroine of the love-story is an impossible creature, who elopes with an eloquent "workingman's orator," lives with him for more than a year, and then returns to her father's house to be as much as ever the "idol and the fancy's queen" of Philip Breton. He marries her with enthusiasm, in spite of the gravest doubts as to her reputation, and presently flings up all his plans, gets rid of his mills, and flees with his wife to Europe, since the speech and the looks of those around her express a surely justifiable contempt for her. This is a lame and impotent conclusion, resembling the fall rather than the rise of the rocket. Nevertheless, the book is worth reading for its insight into the life of the workers with their hands. There is exaggeration and incoherence in the style, but there is also some knowledge and some sympathy.

We have read six chapters of 'Cora Lynn,' two at the beginning of the book, two in the middle, and two at the end. Thereupon a proverb

* 'Young Maugars.' By André Theuriet. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1879.

† 'Left-Handed Elsa.' Boston: A. K. Loring.

‡ 'The Breton Mills: A Romance.' By Charles J. Bellamy. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1879.

§ 'Cora Lynn: A Novel.' By John M. Hartley. Philadelphia: Robert J. Hayward & Co. 1879.

suddenly recurred to our memory, which says "It is not necessary to drink up the sea to know that it is salt," and we joyfully ceased to read, having found nothing of interest or even of common sense in the portions selected.

'Money' is a harmless little story, quite free of offence, sketching a part of the lives and fortunes of a group of reasonably interesting French people.

'My Queen,' which is of the same series, is a love-story, with fabulous wealth and beauty on the one side, and a stern and haughty heroism on the other. That frequent modern resource—a desperate fever—brings the solution to the plot, and we leave the chief couple to live "rich, handsome, and happy" for the rest of their lives.

'Ruth Erskine's Crosses' is not a bad book; on the contrary, there is a great deal of goodness in it. All the characters are constantly praying and reading the Bible, and the model girl thinks it the most natural thing in the world to ask a stranger at a first interview "whether she knows the Lord"; yet the impression left on the reader is that a great deal of false morality and worldliness is quite compatible with an uncomfortable amount of religious slang, which some of us have painfully learned.

'Somebody's Ned' is a shriek of a piercing kind against society for tolerating the making and sale of liquors, the sentencing of criminals to prison, and the contracting for convict labor. There are passionate appeals to "the great state," "the wise government" to prevent the inevitable consequences of various acts, and the opinion is manifest (as it is in sundry recent American stories) that it is the function of Government to interfere with more than paternal care in the lives of its subjects, to avert natural results, and provide constant stimulus and oversight for the weak and the wicked. The notion that *Astrea Redux* is to be handed in by some high Government functionary, seems growing in the American mind.

'The Last of the Kerdres' is published in London. It is a sketch of two Breton families who are involved in the cyclone of the French Revolution. It is difficult to write of that time without exciting some interest, at least of association, and that moderate degree belongs to this book. There is no harm in it, nothing incompatible with the facts of the case. We suspect it was easy to write, and it is not difficult to read.

'The Leavenworth Case' deals with all the most potent stimuli. Murder, law, love, and disinheritance are a good allowance for a single volume. The story is well constructed, and is much more comfortable reading than some of Gaboriau's law novels, with which one naturally compares it, as it is all told in the first person by the lawyer who officially watches the legal proceedings and assists in the subsequent investigations as counsel for the Leavenworth family. The motive-power of it all rests in the fascinations of Miss Mary Leavenworth, one of the two nieces who make the family of the murdered man; and the "moral to be deduced" is that young ladies should not be rash, scornful, or worldly-minded. It might also be wished that they should not appear before a considerable number of strange men in "wrappers," but we suppose this is too much to ask of American writers. It is difficult to say much of the book without exposing the plot, which would be most unfair, as the mystery is maintained with much skill to the very end of the book, and the reader is obliged at the close to reconsider his previous impressions as in real life.

We have made the most laborious efforts to read 'Under the Bells,' but, having failed, we can offer a few extracts which may serve as a guide to some intending reader: "How could she ever have association in my mind with one who always delighted in bright apparel, attuning her presence with rare equity to the sunshine of her heart?" "The one a tall and graceful figure, replete with types of radiant loveliness that forced themselves irresistibly on the eye with full power of their engaging, alluring superfluity." Complete mental exhaustion is the natural consequence of forcing one's way through such verbal tangles.

First Blows of the Civil War. The ten years of preliminary conflict in the United States, from 1850 to 1860. A contemporaneous exposition. By James S. Pike. (New York: The American News Company.) —This volume is mainly composed of letters written by Republican poli-

'Money: A Tale.' By Jules Tardieu. Handy Volume Series. New York: D. Appleton & Co.
'My Queen.' Handy Volume Series. New York: D. Appleton & Co.
'Ruth Erskine's Crosses.' By Paney, author of 'Hester Reid,' 'Four Girls at Chautauqua,' etc., etc. Boston: D. Lothrop & Co.
'Somebody's Ned.' By Mrs. A. M. Freeman. Chicago: S. C. Griggs & Co. 1879.
'The Last of the Kerdres.' By William Minturn, author of 'Travels West.' London: Samuel Tinsley & Co. 1879.
'The Leavenworth Case: A Lawyer's Story.' By Anna Katherine Green. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1879.
'Under the Bells: A Romance.' By Leonard Kip, author of 'Enone,' 'The Dead Marquise,' etc. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1879.

ticians and editors during the ten years from 1850 to 1860. To these are added editorials from the *Tribune*, with which Mr. Pike was connected at one time as a correspondent, and letters of Mr. Pike from Washington to that paper on current events. Mr. Pike, who afterwards became minister to the Netherlands, was, earlier in his career, a slashing Washington correspondent, and among the "first blows" of the war his letters must not be forgotten. None of them are of much permanent value, except to the future historian, for whom they may throw light upon disputed points. They will certainly throw some light upon the condition of journalism before the war. They are of a kind that are not to be found now in the regular Washington correspondence of any New York paper. They are editorials, argumentative, laudatory, denunciatory, designed to cheer the faithful and defend the good cause, and lash the enemy to fury, and in their day they no doubt served their purpose. But their day is quite gone, and they are as hard reading now as old sermons. Among the private letters contained in Mr. Pike's collection the most entertaining are those of Mr. Greeley, Mr. C. A. Dana, and Count Gurovski. With the lively and irascible Count it was, it seems, Mr. Pike's custom to discuss "the sublime questions of ontology, trinity, general and special philosophy," though there is remarkably little trace of any such discussion in these pages. The book would have been much more interesting if the letters and editorials had been connected by the author by means of a running narrative. As it stands, it is rather a confusing jumble of "first blows," and a captious critic might perhaps find fault with the author's picture of the preliminary fray, on the score that the conflict is made to centre about the figure of Mr. Pike himself rather more than historical truth would warrant us in believing that it actually did. But time settles all questions of this sort in a way so mortifying to human pride, that authors must claim the right to manage their own perspective in their own way while it is still in their power.

Summer-Savory. By Benj. F. Taylor, LL.D. (Chicago: S. C. Griggs & Co. 12mo, pp. 212. 1879.)—This is an unusually miscellaneous bundle of papers; one may find among them descriptions of Western travel, of picnic parties, of the dog-days, of country ball-rooms, of thunder-storms, of retired farmers; besides short essays on Hats, on Winks, on Funeral Extravagances; and recollections of the author's childhood—none of them important subjects; yet neither did Elia choose important subjects always. Mr. Taylor's strong point, like Elia's, is his manner. A glance at his manner may be worth taking. We quote the first sentences of his book, the "specimen brick" in this case showing quite accurately what the house is like :

"The world is out of sight," says Mr. Taylor. "The high tides of midsummer have rolled over it. The green volumes of the maples, the chopping seas of the swath-ridged meadows have submerged and washed our planet quite away. The armed squadrons of corn are marching to the tune of 100 in the shade. . . . The English sparrow goes on with its saucy talk and its ceaseless paternosters of beaded eggs the year round. What a pugnacious, aggressive ounce of British bird it is! O for another Bunker Hill! And yet some cry, Spare, oh, the sparrow!"

'Summer-Savory' may be called a note-book of fancies—a poet's notebook, if you choose; in which every fancy that rises is set down without choice or pruning. They are not select enough for poetry, nor chastened enough for prose; they remind us too pressingly of Mr. Talmage's vivacities. But in all fairness let us read the best thing in the book; it is a description of what we see whenever we look out of a railway train going at high speed :

"A man hatched and reconsidered. There's a dot on the track about the size of a Darwinian primal egg. It begins to hatch! It develops legs and arms and feet and head. It is as tall as a pen-holder, a walking-stick, a man. It is a man; and the man stands not 'upon the order of his going,' but goes at once, bolts the track and makes for the fence. We pass him, and behold, he shuts up like a telescope and diminishes by swift degrees, and rolls back into an egg, a dot, a nothing. It is as if he had never been hatched at all."

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.		Publishers.—Prices.
Authors.—Titles.		
Abbott (B. V.), <i>Dictionary of Terms and Phrases used in American or English Prudence</i> , 2 vols.		(Little, Brown & Co.)
Bacon (F.), <i>The Essays, or Counsels Civil and Moral</i> .		(G. P. Putnam's Sons) \$1.25
Champlin (J. D., Jr.), <i>Young Folks' Cyclopaedia of Common Things</i> (Henry Holt & Co.)	3.00	
Cowley (C.), <i>Reminiscences of James C. Ayer</i> , swd.		(Penhaligon Printing Co.)
Dorr (Julia C. R.), <i>Friar Anselmo, and Other Poems</i> .		(Charles Scribner's Sons) 1.25
Fothergill (Dr. J. M.), <i>The Maintenance of Health</i> .		(G. P. Putnam's Sons) 1.25
Gladstone (W. E.), <i>Gleanings of Past Years</i> , Vols. v., vi., vii.. (Charles Scribner's Sons) 3.00		
Inman (F. T.), <i>Ancient Pagan and Modern Christian Symbolism</i> , 3d ed.		(J. W. Bouton)
Jennings (H.), <i>The Rosicrucians</i> , 2d ed.		
Longfellow (H. W.), <i>Poetical Works, Illustrated</i> , Parts 7, 8, swd.		(Houghton, Osgood & Co.)
Markham (Capt. A. H.), <i>Northward Ho!</i>		(Macmillan & Co.) 2.00
Monkhouse (W. C.), <i>Turner</i> .		(Scribner & Welford)
Parkman (F.), <i>La Salle and the Discovery of the Great West</i> , 11th ed., revised.		(Little, Brown & Co.)
Potter (Louisa), <i>Lancashire Memories</i> .		(Macmillan & Co.) 1.75
Sheldon (E. E.), <i>Short German Grammar</i> .		(Ginn & Heath)

